README

Hello! This is the theory file that I started writing before my sophomore year, and has been updated every now and again ever since. I decided to make it open source to help make theory more accessible. I hope that it can be a good guide about the process of writing shells, the types of arguments that are common in theory, how to answer shells, etc.

Since this file is ~5 years old, there will be some arguments that are dated, written inefficiently, or could cause your judge to pull their hair out if you read them. So a word of caution before reading any random shell from this file in round. That being said, an overwhelming majority of what is in here is still usable and there is also some more recent stuff as well. Some of the shells AT tricks may be particularly useful ☺

Anyway, I hope this file can help in some way for your process of learning theory or in theory debates to come. If you want to learn more about theory or are new to it check out this article I wrote: <http://www.vbriefly.com/2015/10/11/basics-of-ld-theory-by-jackson-lallas/>
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Section 1: Theory Generics

# Fairness > K

1. Theory determines which arguments can and can’t be read in round, thus offense on theory logically precludes cross applications from the K to take it out.
2. Theory link turns the k. Abuse prevents me from accurately portraying my discourse or explaining the problems with the k. Theory shows that the K can’t come first because theory questions whether I have access to offense on the K or k comes first arguments, so even if they win their role of the ballot you vote on theory
3. fairness is a prerequisite to any form of discussion – turns all your K impacts. Galloway[[1]](#footnote-1)

Debate as a dialogue sets an argumentative table, where [allows] all parties [to] receive a relatively fair opportunity to voice their position. Anything that fails to allow participants to have their position articulated denies one side of the argumentative table a fair hearing. The affirmative side is set by the topic and fairness requirements. While affirmative teams have recently resisted affirming the topic, in fact, the topic selection process is rigorous, taking the relative ground of each topic as its central point of departure. Setting the affirmative reciprocally sets the negative. The negative crafts approaches to the topic consistent with affirmative demands. The negative crafts disadvantages, counter-plans, and critical arguments premised on the arguments that the topic allows for the affirmative team. **According to fairness** norms, each side sits at a relatively balanced argumentative table. When one side takes more than its share, competitive equity suffers. However, it also undermines the respect due to the other involved in the dialogue. **When one side excludes the other, it** fundamentally **denies the personhood of the other** participant (Ehninger, 1970, p. 110). A pedagogy of debate as dialogue takes this respect as a fundamental component. A desire to be fair is a fundamental condition of a dialogue that takes the form of a demand for equality of voice. Far from being a banal request for links to a disadvantage, fairness is a demand for respect, a demand to be heard, a demand that a voice **backed by** literally months upon months of preparation, **research, and critical thinking** not be silenced. Affirmative cases that suspend basic fairness norms operate to exclude particular negative strategies. Unprepared, one side comes to the argumentative table unable to meaningfully participate in a dialogue. They are unable to “understand what ‘went on…’” and are left to the whims of time and power (Farrell, 1985, p. 114). Hugh Duncan furthers this line of reasoning: Opponents not only tolerate but honor and respect each other because in doing so they enhance their own chances of thinking better and reaching sound decisions. **Opposition is necessary because it sharpens thought** in action. We assume that argument, discussion, and talk, among free an informed people who subordinate decisions of any kind, because it is only through such discussion that we **[to] reach agreement** which binds us to a common cause…If we are to be equal…relationships among equals must find expression in many formal and informal institutions (Duncan, 1993, p. 196-197). **Debate** **compensates for the exigencies of the world by** offering a framework that **maintain[ing]s equality for the sake of the conversation** (Farrell, 1985, p. 114). For example, an affirmative case on the 2007-2008 college topic might defend neither state nor international action in the Middle East, and yet claim to be germane to the topic in some way. The case essentially denies the arguments that state action is oppressive or that actions in the international arena are philosophically or pragmatically suspect. Instead of allowing for the dialogue to be modified by the interchange of the affirmative case and the negative response, the affirmative subverts any meaningful role to the negative team, preventing them from offering effective “counter-word” and undermining the value of a meaningful exchange of speech acts. Germaneness and other substitutes for topical action do not accrue the dialogical benefits of topical advocacy.

Prefer this a) turns your inclusion arguments since I’m excluded from this discussion if you’re unfair – this outweighs your form of exclusion since it’s effects are tangible to this round instead of abstract b) the forum of debate no links your arguments about problems outside of it since it establishes equality for the sake of conversation – only fairness matters within this round

RVI’s

Theory Is an RVI

1. Theory is an RVI because it must be a two way street. My opponent gains a 2-1 advantage without the RVI. This puts me at a disadvantage, because they can win off of multiple layers of the flow while I can only win off of one. Thus, theory must be an RVI to maintain reciprocity on the theoretical level.
2. RVI’s Discourage unnecessary theory debates. Debaters will be more cautious when initiating the theory debate if theory is an RVI. This will deter bad theory debates, because debaters would not want to engage on the theoretical level if the shell could easily be beat back. RVI’s allow the focus of the debate to shift from bad theory back to the substantive level.
3. Theory must be an RVI because of the time that I invest in the theory debate. Without an RVI theory is a time suck in my rebuttal speeches, taking away from my ability to sufficiently cover the substantive debate. My time allocation is skewed because I have to spend a sufficient amount of time covering theory and substance, while my opponent can collapse onto the layer that I undercover.
4. Theory must be an RVI or else it becomes a no risk issue. This proliferates bad theory debates, because debaters could run multiple, bad theory shells without losing on the theoretical level. Theory must be an RVI to check back theory as a no risk issue.

Theory is not an RVI

1. RVI’s prevent theory from checking abuse. I wouldn’t want to initiate a theory debate against an abusive case if my opponent could win the theory debate on an RVI. This is especially bad because it allows good theory debaters to get away with abusive strategies because they could easily win off of an RVI.
2. RVI’s are logically incoherent. They turn a defensive argument into an offensive reason to vote a debater down. Debaters don’t just win the debate for being fair or educational.
3. RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would intentionally go into rounds with abusive positions and prepared counter interpretations. This takes away from substantive debate because debaters will intentionally cause a theory debate for easy access to the ballot.
4. RVI’s encourage debaters to go all in on theory. If theory was an RVI then debaters would spend entire rebuttal speeches to ensure that they win the theory debate. This is bad for debate because it takes away from all substantive discussion. It also harms structural fairness because it muddles the theory debate and makes it harder for the judge to make a fair decision.
5. Theory is reciprocal without an RVI. Debaters can always initiate the theory debate whenever they want, and then weigh between abuse from other theory shells. RVI’s are unnecessary to win off of theory.

Competing interps/Reasonability

Competing Interpretations

1. Reasonability is arbitrary – It’s impossible to determine what strategy is reasonable and what isn’t. Reasonability increases judge intervention because the judge ultimately decides what is reasonable, which is based on preferences for argumentation
2. Reasonability leads to competing interpretations. Reasonability itself only begs the question of what is reasonable. IN order to determine what is a reasonably fair or educational strategy, we have to look to competing interpretations.
3. Competing interpretations prevent a race to the bottom. Reasonability encourages debaters to form strategies that are as least fair and educational as possible. In order to maintain educational and fair strategies, look to competing interpretations.
4. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations or else theory loses its purpose. Theory debate is about setting rules for the activity. Only through competing interpretations can we determine what actually is the best norm for the activity. Reasonability prevents theory from setting norms because it only determines if debaters were reasonably fair or educational, and doesn’t justify a norm for the activity.

Reasonability

1. Competing interpretations cause a race to the top. Debaters will continue to offer a counter interpretation as long as the interp is marginally better. This is detrimental to debate’s educational value, because it shifts the focus of the round away from substance to theory..
2. Reasonability prevents bad theory debates. Debaters could always point out something that is minimally abusive in a case, and then turn it into a game over issue. Reasonability stops bad theory debates because it allows debaters to appeal to a reasonable standard, even if the interpretation is marginally better for debate.
3. Reasonability allows debaters to focus more on the substantive level of the debate. Competing interpretations encourage debaters to go all in on the theory debate and spend entire speeches explaining why their norm is the best for the activity. Reasonability allows debate to return to substance because it shortens the amount of time debaters spend discussing theoretical issues.
4. Reasonability allows debaters to run more creative and varied positions. Under competing interpretations, debaters are held to the absolutely most fair or educational positions. This ultimately harms the educational value of debate, because it prevent debaters from experimenting with different positions and types of arguments.

Drop the Debater/Argument

Drop the Debater

1. Dropping the debater deters further abuse. Debaters will be less likely to run abusive arguments if they cause a loss. Dropping the argument has no lasting impact; Dropping the argument gives debaters no incentive to remove an abusive argument from case if they occasionally can’t use them in rounds.
2. Dropping the argument gives debaters a bad time tradeoff on theory. Firstly, I could spend one to two minutes of my speech on theory, which would be wasted if my opponent could simply get rid of the argument. This skews my time because I lose all the time I invested in theory while my opponent has no negative time trade off.
3. Dropping the argument encourages debaters to bait theory. Debaters would fill their cases with short, abusive spikes or a priori arguments to bait the theory debate. They could then drop the abusive arguments in the next speech and then go for the under covered substantive level. Theory must be drop the debater to prevent debaters from running abusive and un-educational positions.
4. Dropping the argument skews substantive strategy. I don’t know if I am going to win the theory debate, so I am forced to spend time answering abusive arguments. Furthermore, drop the argument is bad because its impossible to properly adjudicate the substantive layer of the flow with abuse, so we must look to the theoretical layer to choose the winner.

Drop the Argument

1. Dropping the argument prevents bad theory debate. Debaters could always find one marginally abusive spike or argument in a case, and then explode it into a game over issue. Dropping the argument prevents bad theory because it ensures that debaters will only run theory against arguments that thoroughly skew fairness or education.
2. Dropping the argument shifts the focus of the debate back to substance. Drop the debater arguments encourage debaters to go all in on theory in later speeches. Dropping the argument allows debaters to concede to a theory shell, drop an abusive argument, and then return to substantive clash.
3. Dropping the debater gives debaters an unfair time tradeoff on theory. Debaters shouldn’t be able to win the round because of a short argument that I made in my case. They turn a small argument into a game over issue, which further harms my time tradeoffs because I am forced to spend my entire rebuttal speeches explaining why I shouldn’t be voted down for one argument.
4. Dropping the debater deters debaters from innovating new strategies. Debaters would not want to create new case ideas or strategies if they could be voted down for their innovation. Ultimately, dropping the debater takes away from debate’s education because it punishes debaters from being creative and exploring the literature.

Fairness Voter

Fairness is a voter

1. Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins/losses.
2. Fairness is the voter because debaters must be on an equitable level before engaging in substantive argumentation.

Fairness>Education

1. Unfair strategies are un-educational. Allowing unfair strategies encourages debaters to make underdeveloped arguments and run abusive positions to gain an edge over opponents. This harms education because
2. Debaters will extend blippy arguments to win the round; thus preventing substantive clash.
3. Unfair strategies further prevent clash because debaters won’t be able to answer them. This is detrimental to clash skills, argument interaction, and critical thinking , as I can’t formulate responses to an abusive position.
4. Fairness outweigh education because education is a reversible harm. I can always read up more on the topic literature or philosophical literature later, or do rebuttal re-does to increase my clash and critical thinking skills. However, an unfair decision is permanent.
5. The judge’s obligation is to vote for the debater that did the best debating. Unfair strategies prevent the judge from deciding who was the best debater because the substantive level of the flow is skewed. Even if one debater is being more educational, without fairness judges can’t actually choose a winner.
6. Fairness precludes the evaluation of any layer if a theory argument indicts that layer since it comes prior to the evaluation of who even won that layer in the first place. Massey et al:

“Pre-Fiat Arguments” [same author quals] Emily Massey, Grant Reiter, Geoff Kristof 2/3/14 http://nsdupdate.com/2014/02/03/pre-fiat-arguments-by-emily-massey-grant-reiter-and-geoff-kristof/

Third, pre-fiat debaters claim that their impacts precede fairness. To see what’s wrong with this, we need just to remember why fairness matters in debate in the first place. **Fairness constrains substance since abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of who did the better debating on the substantive layer. It constrains pre-fiat impacts for** exactly **the same reason. Even if the better debater is the person who resists oppression the most, abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of who did** the better debating on **that** pre-fiat layer.

B. No impact to critical education – I can gain education and learn about a particular role of the ballot out of round but fairness is a necessary practice that must be practiced within rounds.

C. Inclusivity: an unfair model of debate kills the incentive for people to debate in the first place. That link turns all their offense since there’s no incentive to do work, read and come to tournaments to learn anything. **Speice and Lyle**[[2]](#footnote-2)

As with any game or sport, creating a level playing field that afford[ing]s each competitor a fair chance of victory is integral to the continued existence of debate as an activity. If the game is slanted toward one particular competitor, the other[s] participants are likely to pack up their tubs and go home, as they don’t have a realistic shot of winning such a “rigged game.” Debate simply wouldn’t be fun if the outcome was pre-determined and certain teams knew that they would always win or lose. The incentive to work hard to develop new and innovative arguments would be non-existent because wins and losses would not relate to how much research a particular team did. TPD, as defined above, offers the best hope for a level playing field that makes the game of debate fun and educational for all participants.

D. Legitimacy – if debates aren’t fair debaters won’t think that K debate is legitimate since they’ll think it of as merely an exclusionary move rather than a real, substantive, intellectual decision making issue. Thus, unfairness undermines the education argument out of the role of the ballot.

E. Reading unfair and nontopical AC’s only incentivizes avoiding the substance of the aff. Lots of judges find T against such strategies largely legitimate and the argument does have a stronger link. But if the aff is reasonably topical then frivolous arguments just look stupid and debaters are more likely to talk about liberating oppressed groups.

F. A fair [and topical] version of your [K/aff] solves my impacts cause you’re predictable and equitable as well as 99% of your impacts since we’ll still get good discussion relating to [Y]. All you had to do is [meet my interp by X].

Education Voter

Education is a voter

1. Education is the voter because the purpose of debate is to educate debaters. Schools don’t fund debate because it is a fair activity, rather they value debate because it is uniquely educational.
2. Education is the voter because the lasting value of debate comes from the skills that debaters develop. Nobody cares about one unfair decision in the future, rather they value the educational skills that they develop through debating.

Education > Fairness

1. Education is the lasting impact of debate. Nobody will care about one unfair round later in the future. Rather, the skills of argument interaction and research will always stay with debaters.
2. Debate is uniquely valuable for education. If debaters only wanted a competitive activity, they could pursue athletic events. However, we do debate because it is educational.
3. Education outweighs fairness because debate is an unfair activity. One debater will always speak last, and the negative will always have a good time tradeoff in rebuttal speeches. Debate can never be truly fair, however we can always uphold the educational value of the activity.

Decision Making Voter

Decision Making is a voter

1. Debate offers a unique portable skillset. No other activity forces competitors to engage in defense of positions, refutation, and strategic thinking within time constraints.
2. The nature of debate makes decision making and argumentation skills its highest goal. Parcher[[3]](#footnote-3)

James McBath adds, "[a]t its essence, forensics is an educational activity which provides students with the opportunity to develop a high level of proficiency in writing, thinking, reading, speaking and listening"(p10). Debate is a uniquely beneficial educational tool in part because of the value of argumentation theory itself. The creation of an argument is one of the most complex cognitive acts that a person can engage in. Creating an argument requires the research of issues, organization of data, analysis of data, snythesization of different kinds of data, and an evaluation of information with respect to which conclusion it may point. After this process, the formulation of an argument requires the debater to consider differing methods of critiquing reason, the decision making formula, the audience and the criteria of decision making. In the end, arguments must be communicated to an audience clearly and succinctly - a difficult cognitive process requiring conversion between thought, written rhetoric and oral rhetoric. At the end, the debate itself requires the processing of other's arguments and then the reformulation and defense of one's original position.

Decision Making Impact/weighing

1. Decision making has the biggest real world impact. Empirically, many debaters go onto leadership positions. Decision making provides debaters with necessary skillsets for various fields. Parcher[[4]](#footnote-4)

Survey data also demonstrates that debaters go on to leadership positions in a variety of fields. The Matlon datareveals that of competitive collegiate debaters, 30% became university educators , 15% were top corporate executives and 10% were working in the executive or legislative branches of government. Others entered the clergy, started their own businesses or became writers and publishers. A closer examination of data regarding political figures reveals interesting numbers and names. One survey showed that "over 80% of all current members of congress were on their schools forensics team" (Swanson, p2). Two lists can be found at the end of this section, one lists notable figures who were debaters and the other contains the remarks of notable leaders about the importance of competitive debate. Other scholarly material demonstrate the relevance of debate to leadership training. In a Chronicle of Higher Education article, Kaye (1991) argues that schools must educate the next generation of public intellectuals. The primary responsibility for this lofty goal is given to competitive forensics because of their unique value in teaching critical thinking, public debate, training in argumentation, and the foundation of argument in history, humanities and social sciences. The reason for this correlation lies in part in the skills that debate teaches. Debate programs typically draw some of the finest students in a school. The arguments stated elsewhere are clearly relevant here: Debate teaches students critical thinking, communication skills, research techniques, and listening skills. It educates them in the ethics of communication and engulfs them in debate about values and society. Debate also gives students a taste of policy and value-based decision making. It allows them to engage in role playing which models argumentation which occurs at the highest levels of many fields. The learning occurs in a way that facilitates confidence and eliminates the communication apprehension that can block bright minds from participating in the great decisions of the day (Sprague; Bartanen). Debate training empowers students by allowing them to influence policy choices. Debaters learn not to be intimidated by the rhetoric of policy debate (Dauber, 205). Moreover, participants in debate are some of those most qualified to take on leadership in our society. The Matlon survey reveals some astounding figures. Of 703 former debaters surveyed, 633 had at least 1 advanced degree, and 209 had more than one. Additionally, four in ten had law degrees, four in ten had masters degrees and two in ten had a Ph.D. or other doctoral degree.

DM > Fairness

1. Fairness is only instrumentally valuable. The only reason that fair debate matters is because debate itself is a valuable activity; thus if the higher goal of decision making is harmed impacts back to it always outweigh marginal losses in fairness.
2. Decision making skills are key to check back unfair strategies. Greater skills in decision making allow debaters to form strategies against and think of substantively better responses against an abusive position. Thus, decision making skills solve for deficits in fairness.
3. Decision making is a permanent benefit from debate, while fairness only matters within the context of this round. Debaters will always keep their skills in strategy, position building, and argumentation but the impacts of a win or loss only effect individual tournaments.
4. Decision making defines who the better debater is through comparison of advocacies and strategic thinking. Thus, the only way the judge can adjudicate who did the better debating is to determine which debater was the best decision maker.

DM > Education

1. Decision making specifies what form of education is important. Education is too broad- it would justify practices such as teaching math during rounds because it would be most educational. Prefer decision making because it limits the scope of education and defines what education impacts matter.
2. Education about topics and philosophy is not permanent. Debaters forget a vast majority of topic specific arguments and philosophical positions over time. Prefer decision making because it is a permanent impact; debaters always retain their skills in argumentation and critical thinking developed from debate.
3. Prefer decision making impacts because it is unique to debate. There are various philosophy classes, articles, and classes in schools that debaters can gain all philosophical and topical knowledge from without even ever doing debate. Decision making is a unique educational good to debate as an activity.

Critical Thinking Voter

Critical Thinking is a Voter

1. Debate is a unique activity that forces debaters to defend positions, answer positions, and develop strategies within time constraints. This provides debaters with great critical thinking skills- unique to debate- that are also portable outside the activity. (Optional Card) Parcher furthers the argument

The kind of oppositional thinking encouraged by debate clearly contributes to critical thinking skills for a variety of reasons. There is strong empirical evidence, for example, that utilizing devils advocacy helps improve the understanding of strategic problems. In fact, devils advocacy has been used successfully by a number of companies for this exact purpose (Schwenk, 1988). Such research mirrors what debate coaches have known for decades. Debaters learn much more about critical thinking than the old adage "there are two sides to every coin." They learn how to spot errors in reasoning and proof. They gain a greater respect for the complexity of ideas and they learn how to criticize in a productive way based on facts and logic. Many former debaters have testified that participation in debate exposed them to complex ways of thinking which prepared them for what they would face in graduate school and their professional lives. James Greenwood, Chairperson in Communications at the University of Findlay noted that "debate was more important to my career than any single course on the undergraduate and graduate level. Debate develops skills in organization, clarity and depth of analysis that most students do not encounter until the master's thesis" (Shroeder and Shroeder, p16

1. Critical thinking is not only the highest goal of the debate, but it has the biggest real world impact. Parcher[[5]](#footnote-5)

Many authors note that leadership in a changing world requires students to learn to critically analyze and evaluate ideas (Adler; Dressel & Mayhew; Young). Besides being an obvious and important goal of any educational institution, forensics directors have rated developing critical thinking ability as the highest educational goal of the activity (Rieke). Debaters themselves have suggested that it should be considered the most important goal (Matlon and Keele). A healthy ability to think critically about information is especially critical in a world overflowing with data. An old debater research adage holds that "you can prove anything if you look long enough." The shuddering growth in information and access to it has changed this sarcastic notion into a virtual truism. The ability and willingness to critically examine information is a highly prized skill among employees, managers and executives, lawyers, doctors and other professions. Society desperately needs training devices that can help people manage information in a trenchant fashion.

Critical Thinking > Fairness

1. Fairness is only instrumentally valuable. The only reason that fair debate matters is because debate itself is a valuable activity; thus if the higher goal of critical thinking is harmed impacts back to it always outweigh marginal losses in fairness.
2. Fairness is only a temporary harm; an unfair strategy will only harm a debater for one debate round. However, the impacts of critical thinking skills are permanent and can be applied outside of the activity.

* Also the decision making weighing can probably be applied here.

Critical Thinking > Education

1. The impact of critical thinking is empirically verified. There is only a slim chance that a random topical fact or framework will be instrumental to education, however it is proven that debate enhances critical thinking skills. Parcher

The empirical evidence demonstrating a connection between participation in debate and learning the skills of critical thinking is quite extensive. In a recent review of research on the subject, Colbert and Biggers noted that "50 years of research correlates debate training with critical thinking skills" (p212). Keefe, Harte and Norton reviewed the research and concluded that, "[m]any researchers over the past four decades have come to the same general conclusions. Critical thinking ability is significantly improved by courses in argumentation and debate and by debate experience" (p33-34).The most recent study concluded not only that participation in competitive debate enhances critical thinking skills, but that compared to academic pursuits of a similar time length, "competitive forensics demonstrates the largest gain in critical thinking skills" (Allen, p6).

1. Critical thinking is a unique benefit to engaging in debate. Debaters can always read about the topic or take a philosophy class for educational benefits, however the impacts of critical thinking solely occur within the activity itself.

Section 2: Framework and Burdens

Nib Bad

1. Interpretation: Burdens must be necessary and sufficient
2. Violation: My opponent is running a NIB by \_\_\_\_\_\_
3. Standards
4. Strategy Skew- A Nib skews my strategy because I am forced to cover multiple layers of the flow. I don’t know which arguments my opponent will go for in the next speech, so I am forced to try to cover equally. This inevitably skews my strategy because my opponent will go for the under covered argument in the next speech rendering all my work in a rebuttal useless. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage positions and arguments to access the ballot. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because it fosters critical thinking skills when forming a strategy.
5. Time Skew- A Nib skews time allocation in rebuttal speeches. Debaters are forced to allocate sufficient time to the Nib and also the substantive layer of the flow. This puts debaters at a disadvantage because it is near impossible to adequately cover both the nib and the case layer of the flow with the time in rebuttal speeches. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to make arguments to access the ballot. Preventing time skew is key to education because it allows debaters to explore issues within the topic literature and engage in argument clash.
6. Reciprocity- A Necessary but insufficient burden gives my opponent a 2-1 advantage. They can win off of multiple layers of the flow, while I am restricted to one. This destroys structural reciprocity because debaters have unequal access to the ballot. Reciprocity is key to fairness because if one debater must do more work to access the ballot they are at a substantive disadvantage. Reciprocity outweighs other claims to fairness because it is a pre-requisite to any fair debate. Reciprocity is key to education because it allows for substantive clash, increasing argumentation skills.
7. Turn Ground- A nib destroys turn ground. Debaters are forced to put defensive responses on the nib, and cannot possible garner offense from it. Lack of turn ground is uniquely bad because
8. Reciprocity- My opponent gains access to arguments that they can garner offense from that I cannot. This prevents reciprocity on that layer of the flow, giving my opponent an advantage.
9. Clash- Lack of turn ground decreases argument clash. I am restricted to defensive arguments, eliminating multiple offense responses. Clash is key to fairness because the judge requires argument clash do fairly decide the round or else arguments are impossible to compare. Clash is a gateway to all education because it develops critical thinking and argument interaction skillis.

Turn ground itself is key to fairness because debaters must be able to garner offense on all layers of the flow to access the ballot. Turn ground is essential ground because it is a gateway to access to different layers of the flow that otherwise debaters would not have. Turn ground is key to education because it expands argument clash and responses debaters can make.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Multiple Nibs Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters may only run one necessary but insufficient burden.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Strategy Skew- Multiple Nibs eliminate my ability to form a coherent substantive strategy. My opponent becomes a moving target in the later rebuttal speeches. I don’t know which nib my opponent will go for, so I have to cover all the nibs equally. This undermines any potential strategy because my opponent will go all in during the next speech on the under covered layer of the flow, rendering my rebuttal work and strategy useless. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage positions and arguments against opponents. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because debaters foster critical thinking skills when developing a strategy.
5. Time Skew- Multiple nibs uniquely destroy my ability to make time allocations and time tradeoffs in rebuttal speeches. I am forced sufficiently designate my time to multiple layers of the flow. This skews my time allocation because it is nearly impossible to adequately answer every nib and then the case level of the debate in rebuttal speeches. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters require time allocations to make arguments to access the ballot. Preventing time skew is key to education because it fosters critical thinking skills to make proper time tradeoffs and allocations in rebuttal speeches.
6. Reciprocity- Multiple nibs destroy structural reciprocity. They give my opponent a (# of nibs) to 1 advantage against me on the flow. This is extremely detrimental to reciprocity, because my opponent gains multiple substantive routes to the ballot while I can only use one. It further harms reciprocity because the nibs function at a higher level than the case debate, so I can’t even access my out before covering my opponent’s. Reciprocity is key to fairness because competitive activities require participants to be at an equitable level. Reciprocity outweighs all other fairness claims because it functions as a pre-requisite to fair debate. Reciprocity is key to education
7. Turn Ground- Multiple nibs eliminate nearly all of my turn ground in the round. I am restricted to defensive responses on the nibs, while my opponent can garner offense from any of the nibs. Restricting turn ground has the impacts of
8. Reciprocity- My opponent gains access to offense on layers of the flow that I do not. This destroys reciprocity, because the lack of turn ground provides my opponent with multiple outs on the flow.
9. Clash- I am restricted only to defensive responses against the nibs. This prevents an extremely important layer of clash on the flow, and argument interaction and comparison. Clash is key to fairness because the only way to compare arguments when deciding the round is through clash. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all critical thinking and argument interaction skills that debate fosters.

Turn ground is key to fairness because debaters must have access to offense on all layers of the flow. Turn ground is the most important ground because it creates new ways to access the ballot in rebuttal speeches. Turn ground is key to education because it fosters critical thinking skills to garner offense from different arguments

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

One Nib Good

1. Interpretation: Debaters may run one necessary and insufficient burden, provided it is based in the topic literature.
2. I meet
3. Standards
4. Real World Decision Making- Policy and people makers don’t ignore glaring problems with a specific course of action. Rather, they examine the issues with a certain action or idea before deciding whether or not it should be implemented. One necessary but insufficient burden allows for debaters to reflect the real world decision making process. Debaters can examine multiple problems that the literature presents with the resolution, instead of being restricted to discussion of only one. Real World Decision making is key to education because it teaches debaters critical thinking skills and argument interaction that is valuable outside of debate. Real World Decision making is key to fairness because it creates all predictable and pragmatic concerns about specific topics. Real world decision making outweighs all other fairness claims because it forms the topic literature and arguments that debaters enter a round with, without it the resolution would be meaningless.
5. Topic Literature- One Nib increases exploration of the topic literature in multiple ways. Firstly, it encourages debaters to research and prepare for more topical issues before a round, rather than just prepare nibs bad theory shells for arguments they don’t want to deal with. Secondly, it increases discussion of issues of the literature within round and provides more topical clash. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic Literature is key to education because it increases topic specific clash and topical education. Topic specific clash and education outweigh claims to education because it provides skills and knowledge that is unique to a two month period.
6. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the lasting impact of debate. No debater will care about one unfair strategy or decision after they leave the activity. Rather, they will always maintain the knowledge and skill set that debate uniquely grants them. Vote my opponent down to maintain the educational value of debate. Also, drop the debater because 1) to prevent further abuse from their strategy, and 2) because my opponent would get an unfair time tradeoff if they could just kick the abusive argument. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on unpredictable preferences of argumentation that the judge has.

A Priori bad

1. Interpretation- Debaters must link all offense relevant to the affirmation or negation of the resolution back to a standard.

* To clarify, this means that debaters cannot run an a priori argument.

1. Violation- (Round Specific)
2. Standard
3. Clash- An a priori argument takes away from all argument clash. They encourage debaters to hide an a priori in their case, and then extend it in the rebuttal speech for an easy win. This eliminates argument clash because debaters don’t have to engage on the substantive level, rather they can rely on blippy dropped arguments to access the ballot. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact for the judge to fairly decide the round. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all argument interaction and critical thinking skills, as well as further explores issues within the topic and philosophical literature.
4. Literature-
5. Topic Literature- An a priori argument ignores the topic literature. They create quick reasons to affirm or negate the resolution on face, ignoring topical issues and arguments. Even if an a priori is loosely based in the literature, it is still detrimental because it ignores most topical issues and clash. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it fosters skills of topical clash and teaches debaters about issues unique to a two month period.
6. Philosophical literature- An a priori is detrimental to the exploration of philosophical literature. Instead of engaging in philosophical discussion, debaters avoid the framework debate by forming a quick pre-standards argument. Philosophical literature is key to fairness because it is the source of all frameworks relevant to debate. Philosophical literature is central to education because debaters participate in LD debate not just for topical discussion, but also because it is a unique forum for philosophical discourse.
7. Time Skew- An a priori argument skews time. One debater gains instant access to the ballot with a five second blip. However, I am forced to spend a disproportionate amount of time on the a priori or else I lose the debate. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters require time to form routes to the ballot. Preventing time skew is key to education because it allows for substantive clash and argumentation.
8. Reciprocity- An a priori argument destroys reciprocity. I am at a 2-1 disadvantage to my opponent to access the ballot. An a priori forces me to answer one small layer of the flow before the layer that I can win off matters. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equitable level to engage in competition. Reciprocity is key to education because equal access to the flow is necessary to substantiate critical thinking and clash on arguments.
9. Turn Ground- An a priori argument prevents me from accessing turn ground. I cant make any offensive responses on the a priori, and I am restricted to defense that may or may not be sufficient to beat the argument back. Turn ground is key to fairness because debaters must have access to offense at all substantive layers of the flow. Turn ground is key to education because it allows debaters to form new routes for clash.
10. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Multiple A Prioris bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must link all offense relevant to the affirmation or negation of the resolution back to a standard.

* To clarify, this means that debaters cannot run a priori arguments

1. Violation- (Round Specific)
2. Standards
3. Clash- Multiple a priori arguments eliminate all substantive clash. Debaters can easily put a prioris in cases and then extend dropped ones or beat back answers for an easy win. This defeats the purpose of substantive clash, because a priori arguments function at a higher level than substance. Clash is key to fairness because arguments interact and be compared for the judge to make a fair decision in the round. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to allow critical thinking and argumentation skills, and also allows for the exploration of topical and philosophical literature.
4. Time Skew- Multiple a priori arguments prevent debaters from making coherent time allocations and tradeoffs. One debater gains instant access to the ballot with multiple, spread out blips. However, I am forced to spend a disproportionate amount of time on every a priori or else I lose the debate. This skews my time because 1) it is near impossible to adequately cover multiple a priori arguments 2) It prevents me form spending an adequate amount of time addressing important substantive issues. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters require time to form routes to the ballot. Preventing time skew is key to education because it allows for substantive clash and argumentation.
5. Strategy Skew- Multiple a priori arguments destroys strategy in all speeches. Debate changes to a game of finding and answering a prioris. This irrevocably skews my strategy because my opponent becomes a moving target in the debate. I don’t know which a priori they will go for, so I have to answer all adequately. Furthermore, my opponent could easily shift the focus onto a dropped or hidden a priori, eliminating the effort of my entire speech. Lastly, my opponent can return focus to the substantive issues when they are inevitably under covered. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against opponents to access the ballot. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because it allows debaters to foster critical thinking skills when forming a strategy.
6. Reciprocity- Multiple a priori arguments destroy structural reciprocity. My opponent gains access to multiple outs and offense from multiple arguments and layers of the flow. However, I am restricted to the substantive case debate. This prevent structural reciprocity, because I only have one out while my opponent has many. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equitable level to engage in competition. Reciprocity outweighs all other fairness claims because it is a pre-requisite to any fair debate. Reciprocity is key to education because competitive equity allows debaters to engage in clash and argument interaction.
7. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Skep Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must only read arguments that accept the existence of normative morality.
2. Violation- (Round specific)
3. Standards
4. Philosophical Clash- Moral skepticism arguments are uniquely bad because they eliminate all philosophical clash. Skepticism prevents philosophical clash because
5. Skepticism denies the existence of normative morality or normative values. This prevents all framework clash because frameworks are based on normative claims and ideas.
6. Skepticism leads to infinite regress. It encourages debaters to keep undermining assumptions in arguments and cases. This eliminates all clash because debaters will only deny the existence of opponent’s arguments. Ultimately, it nullifies the purpose of debate.
7. Skepticism is uniquely bad to philosophical clash because skeptical arguments are recycled across topics. Debaters could always run the same error theory position throughout the year, however topic specific frameworks are restricted to a short period. Thus, clash from skeptical arguments is useless because it is repetitive in nature.

Philosophical clash is key to fairness because judges must look to a moral framework to substantively decide the round. Philosophical clash is key to education because it teaches debaters about philosophical issues and critical thinking. Philosophical clash has the greatest impact back to education because 1) It encourages deeper critical thinking and clash. Instead of pointing out flaws in methodology or providing competing topical warrants, philosophical clash allows debaters to deeply examine and compare competing values. 2) Philosophical clash is unique to LD debate. If debaters only wanted to learn about policy issues, they would do policy debate or pofo. However, debaters do LD because it is a unique forum for philosophical discourse and comparison unavailable anywhere else. 3) Most moral frameworks are unique to a topical area of discussion. Thus, debaters can compare philosophical frameworks that they only have access to during a resolution.

1. Topic Literature- Skeptical arguments ignore all topical discussion. Instead of engaging in topical issues, skepticism allows debaters to ignore the substance of the resolution and gain easy access to the ballot from non-topic specific arguments. Furthermore, skepticism is uniquely bad to topical discussion because debaters recycle skeptical positions, relieving them of the need to ever learn topical issues. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it provides knowledge and clash on issues unique to a two month period.
2. Reciprocity- Skeptical arguments destroy reciprocity. They give my opponent a 2-1 advantage over me. I first have to prove that morality exists before I access the layer of the substantive flow I can win on. Furthermore, my opponent can still prove my moral framework false and turn my contention, putting me at a greater disadvantage against skeptical debaters. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be at an equitable level to engage in competition. Reciprocity has the largest impact to fairness because it is a pre-requisite to fair debate. Reciprocity is key to education because debaters can only exercise critical thinking and proper argument interaction if they are at an equal level.
3. Turn Ground- Skeptical arguments provide no turn ground. I am forced to beat back skepticism with defensive responses, and can garner no offense just by proving that morality exists. Turn ground is key to fairness because debaters must be able to access offense on all substantive layers of the flow. Turn ground is key to education because it encourages debaters to think critically and develop clash against arguments.
4. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Skep Triggers Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must justify a moral framework without arguments that trigger any form of skepticism
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Clash- Skepticism triggers eliminate all substantive clash. Instead of engaging in philosophical and topical issues, debaters extend a skepticism trigger for an easy win. This is detrimental to clash because the round turns into an argument about whether skepticism affirms or negates, and all topical and philosophical discussion nullified. This further harms clash because instead of engaging in argument interaction and comparison debaters will simply pull out reasons why skepticism flows either side from the back files. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact and be compared for a judge to make a fair decision in a round. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all critical thinking and argument interaction skills.
5. Philosophical Literature- Skepticism triggers prevent the exploration of competing moral frameworks. This is detrimental to philosophical literature, because skeptical triggers force debaters to ignore all other moral theories other than the one presented. Skeptical triggers are even worse for philosophical literature because they force debaters to ignore common objections and problems with moral theories that derive from the literature. Philosophical literature is key to fairness because all frameworks relevant and arguments relevant to debate are found within the literature. Philosophical literature is central to education because it is a unique benefit of LD Debate. If debaters only wanted to engage in contention clash, we would all do policy. However, we do LD debate because we value the education from philosophical discourse and clash.
6. Real World- Skepticism triggers butcher moral philosophy. No philosopher puts at the bottom of a book or an article that “if you disagree with my article, you trigger skepticism!” Rather, they spend time forming reasons to prefer their moral framework and comparative reasons to reject others. Real world is key to fairness because all predictable and pragmatic framework concerns are formed by real world processes. Real world is key to education because debaters learn practices and skills that can be transferred outside of debate.
7. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Comparative Worlds Good

1. Interpretation: Debaters must evaluate arguments under a comparative worlds paradigm
2. Violation- (Specific Violation/I meet)
3. Standards
4. Topic Literature- Comparative worlds paradigms encourage debaters to explore and debate the topic literature. Instead of being bogged down in long logic link chains, debaters engage in topical issues. Truth testing paradigms harm the exploration of the literature because they encourage debaters to focus too much on the framework and ignore relevant issues. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic Literature is key to education because it creates clash and discussion on specific issues. Topic Literature outweighs all other claims to education because 1) It is unique to a two month period. Philosophical frameworks are often recycled across topics. However, knowledge and clash within specific topic literature is unique to a short time frame, and thus must be focused on. 2) Debaters are encouraged to do more research to learn about topical issues. This is a unique educational benefit, because philosophical arguments and responses are carried across topics. However, research skills developed by examining the topic literature are only available if we focus on the literature.
5. Clash- Comparative worlds paradigms increase argument clash. Too often framework arguments devolve into chicken and the egg scenarios, with both debaters saying that their framework is a pre-requisite. Comparative worlds avoids this issue by shifting the focus of debate to the topic, but also further increases clash by having debaters engage in evidence comparison and in depth weighing analysis. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact and be compared for the judge to make a fair decision. Clash is key to education because it develops critical thinking and argument interaction skills unique to debate.
6. Real World Decision making- Policy makers and people don’t base their decisions on a comprehensive normative framework. Rather, they compare instances where they take and don’t take an action. The only way for debate to have any value transering to real world decision making processes is to look to comparative worlds. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns for topical and philosophical discussion. Real world decision making is key to education because it teaches debaters skills that are applicable outside of the debate community.
7. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the lasting impact of debate. No debater will care about one unfair strategy or decision after they leave the activity. Rather, they will always maintain the knowledge and skill set that debate uniquely grants them. Vote my opponent down to maintain the educational value of debate. Also, drop the debater because 1) to prevent further abuse from their strategy, and 2) because my opponent would get an unfair time tradeoff if they could just kick the abusive argument. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on unpredictable preferences of argumentation that the judge has.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Truth Testing Good

1. Interpretation: Debate must be evaluated under a truth testing paradigm.
2. Violation- (Round specific/I meet)
3. Standards
4. Philosophical Literature- Truth testing paradigms best represent the philosophical literature. Comparative worlds ignores the literature, and focuses on topical arguments. Truth testing best addresses philosophy because
5. Breadth of Discussion: Comparative worlds paradigms too often lead to consequentialist frameworks. Thus, a majority of philosophical discussion is lost to focus on unil and consequentialism. Truth testing increases breadth of discussion by allowing debaters to argue for diverse frameworks and explore more philosophical issues.
6. Depth of Discussion- Truth testing also expands depth of knowledge of philosophical frameworks. Instead of spending a minute setting up a quick framework, truth testing encourages debaters to create in depth frameworks with nuanced justifications. Comparative worlds is worse for philosophical depth because justifications are often recycled, ie. Look to consequentialism because it respects equality
7. Philosophical Ground- Many philosophical positions are entirely excluded under comparative worlds. Skeptical arguments, a major philosophical field, would be rendered useless under comparative worlds because they have no value in terms of what world is better or worse.

Philosophical literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the framework debate are found within the literature. Philosophical literature outweighs all other claims to fairness because without a framework it is impossible to evaluate floating pieces of offense in a round. Philosophical literature is key to education because it teaches debaters about philosophical issues, positions, and clash. Philosophical literature outweighs all claims to education because:

1. Forum of Debate: Philosophical literature is uniquely important to LD debate. If debaters only wanted to engage in topic specific clash, then they would all do policy debate. However, we participate in LD because it is a unique forum for philosophical discourse and argumentation.
2. Philosophical literature generates the most in depth critical thinking and argumentation skills. Debaters engage on issues of competing values, and are forced to do comparisons that go far beyond which piece of empirical evidence is best.
3. Philosophical education has lasting value outside of debate. Many debaters are inspired by LD philosophy, and go on to be philosophy majors. Furthermore, while debaters will inevitably forget a random topical argument, they will remember the issues in philosophy that were examined.
4. Logical Consistency- Truth testing encourages debaters to form logical chains of argumentation. Truth testing paradigms allow debaters to create an in depth framework, leading from premise and then to conclusion of affirmation or negation of the resolution. Comparative worlds is worse because it overlooks logical chains and conclusions that are common in philosophy. Logical consistency is key to fairness because arguments must be coherent to be leveraged to the ballot. Logical consistency is key to education because arguments that are illogical are inherently un-educational.
5. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the lasting impact of debate. No debater will care about one unfair strategy or decision after they leave the activity. Rather, they will always maintain the knowledge and skill set that debate uniquely grants them. Vote my opponent down to maintain the educational value of debate. Also, drop the debater because 1) to prevent further abuse from their strategy, and 2) because my opponent would get an unfair time tradeoff if they could just kick the abusive argument. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on unpredictable preferences of argumentation that the judge has.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

AEC Good

1. Interpretation: The negative must concede to the affirmative ethical framework, without reconceptualizing it or reading an alternative framework, provided that the affirmative has substantive justifications for the framework, the framework is theoretically fair, and there is justification from the topic literature for the framework.
2. Violation- This is a preemptive theory shell. The negative violates through any reconceptualization of the aff framework, refutation of it, or reading an alternative framework. Additionally any theory against AEC is inherently defensive, as the negative must argue that they may read a framework. Thus, for neg theory against AEC to be offensive it requires an RVI.
3. Standards
4. Topic Literature- INSERT YOUR CARD HERE AND TOPIC SPECIFIC ANALYTIC

Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are grounded in the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it is the source of topic specific knowledge, which is uniquely valuable as it is only accessed for a two month period.

1. Clash- AEC helps to ensure clash on the contention level of the debate. Lawrence[[6]](#footnote-6) explains:

As a consequence of this, there will also be an increase in “clash” in debates as the negative will be required to make their arguments interact with the 1AC. This should be a boon for coaches and judges who are dismayed by the trend toward off-case argumentation that has little or nothing to do with the 1AC. Debates will once again come down to who has the better substantive argumentation about the topic instead of who has “a single piece of offense” that links back to whatever ethical framework ends up being used.

Clash is key to fairness because it ensures minimal judge intervention. Without clash arguments are ships passing in the night- it is impossible to evaluate and compare them, requiring judge intervention. This is especially true of philosophical debates. Philosophy decreases clash and increases intervention, because 1) most philosophical arguments don’t interact, are unresolvable, and judges have a limited knowledge of philosophy and 2) philosophical arguments encourage debaters to keep looking for the highest levels of the debate; ie. Meta-ethics, epistemology, ontology, action theory, etc, to evade clashing the frameworks. Clash is key to education because it enhances critical thinking skills and strategy.

1. Side Bias: AEC helps combat structural negative side bias. First, it ensures that AC offense is not rendered meaningless by negative strategies, as all offense will link to the AC standard. Second, it helps alleviate the problems of the 7-4 6-3 time skew by eliminating the framework debate, allowing the aff to allocate its time on securing offense to the ballot. Third, it accounts for neg flexibility. The negative is flexible to adopt to the affirmative standard, while the Aff’s work can by rendered meaningless by alternative negative postions. Preventing side bias is key to fairness because it ensures that debaters are on a reciprocal level when engaging in substantive clash. Additionally, fairness requires priority for the worst off. Hooker[[7]](#footnote-7)

t smaller benefits for some not be chosen over larger benefits for others. But now focus on a case where your getting some indivisible good would satisfy your need but my getting it instead would benefit me more than you would benefit from getting it. We might nevertheless think that fairness favours your getting the good rather than my getting it. What explains why we might think this? We naturally assume that those who are neediest are worst off. So in the case at hand, we might be assuming that, if you are needy and I am not, you are worse off than I am. If we make this assumption, then the fact that we favour your getting the good rather than my getting it might be explained by our thinking that there is always some reason of fairness for giving a benefit to the worse off rather than to the better off. In other words, in order to reflect on whether satisfying needs is in itself morally important, we need to neutralize the following two facts. One is the fact that satisfying needs will normally bring significant gains in utility. The other is that satisfying the greatest needs will normally benefit the worst off, since normally the worst off are the neediest. What we need for a good test case is one with the following features: (a) There is an indivisible good to be distributed either to you or to me. (b) I need the good and you don't need it or anything else as much as I need this good. (c) You are worse off than I. (d) Your getting the good would benefit you exactly the same amount as my getting it would benefit me. In this case, (d) is obviously neutral and so does not complicate matters. Our case poses an uncomplicated choice between satisfying a need and benefiting the worse off. Reflecting on this case leads me to think that benefiting the worse off is more important than satisfying needs

Thus- if I win any offense from the side bias standard it outweighs all other links to fairness, as since the aff is worse off there is a priority to rectify structural disadvantages.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Also prefer fairness because the judge can’t decide who did the better debating if one debater had an unfair advantage over the other.

AEC Bad

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must allow the negative to read a competing framework, making responses to the affirmative framework, and reconceptualize the affirmative standard without punishing the negative with a loss.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Philosophical Education- AEC entirely eliminates philosophical education by getting rid of the framework debate. Attempts to solve back for philosophical harms; ie. Reading substantive justifications, only further harm philosophy education because it forces debaters to accept them as true, encouraging debaters to support false or fallacious arguments. This means that if there is any risk of offense as to why philosophical education is valuable- that is sufficient to outweigh all impacts from AEC because there is only a marginal gain in clash from adopting the interp but an absolute loss of framework debate. Philosophical education is key to fairness because it frames what impacts are relevant in the round. Philosophical education is key to decision making because it provides debaters with a reference point for forming positions and strategies.
5. Real World- AEC adopts an extremely unrealistic vision of debate. In the real world, the clash on whether or not we want to take an action is rarely over the hyper specific efficacy of policy. Rather, real world arguments focus on differing values amongst decision makers and audience members. Kock[[8]](#footnote-8) explains

These examples further show something that many argumentation scholars take to be rather scandalous, namely that at least as far as the ‘weight’ or ‘strength ’factor in practical reasoning is concerned, there is [has] an ineradicable element of subjectivity in argument appraisal. To those who argue that the admission of such subjectivity is a disgrace to argumentation theory, and who call it ‘extremely relativistic’ and the like, I reply that their own theories are deficient for not seeing what moral philosophers since antiquity have seen, namely the inherent audience relativity of argumentation over issues where values are involved—as they are in any deliberative debate. In argumentation theory, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958) were perhaps the first to fully understand this kind of subjectivity. The divergent ‘value hierarchies’ of audiences is one of the concepts in which they find this subjectivity expressed. It is the same subjectivity that is brought in by Rawls’s last two points, which, let us recall again, are “peculiar to reasoning about values.” Our examples also show that pro and con arguments in the practical domain typically have the status of advantages and drawbacks, as perceived by the arguers. Dick and Jane happen to agree on all the advantages and drawbacks of the armchair. For both of them, those advantages and drawbacks are inherent in the chair. But Dick and Jane disagree on how much weight to assign to them. And no advantages or drawbacks are refuted, rebutted or defeated even if either Dick or Jane prevails. Even if the armchair scheme is abandoned, an armchair like this does not cease to be comfortable. If the family actually buys the chair, it remains inelegant. In the epistemic domain, by contrast, pro and con arguments are only important by virtue of their probative or inferential force (or, with a word used by some theorists and derived from the same verb as “inferential”: their illative force); that is, they are important for what they appear to signify or suggest, not for what they are. Once the issue has been decided one way or the other, the arguments supporting the discarded position lose their relevance. The example of the armchair further shows that in the practical domain pro and con arguments may be real and relevant simultaneously. The advantages and drawbacks are real to the arguers and remain so. In epistemic argumentation, on the other hand, the pro and con arguments may in themselves be real enough, but the two opposite states of affairs signified by the pro and con arguments, respectively, may not both be real or true simultaneously. Further, the strength or weight of arguments in practical argumentation is a matter of degrees. Advantages and drawbacks come in all sizes. Along with this comes the fact that practical argumentation typically persuades by degrees. An individual may gradually come to attribute more weight to a given argument, so he or she may gradually become more favorably disposed towards the proposal. This is one of the reasons why argument in matters of choice is meaningful. Finally, let us repeat that practical reasoning crucially depends on individuals’ subjective value assignment. That goes for each single reason given in the discussion of the issue, but also for the balancing of the multiple, incommensurable reasons relevant to the case.

Real world is key to fairness because all relevant topical ground and controversy is based in real world problems and discussion. Real world is key to decision making because it ensures that decision making skills are developed in a meaningful way that can be applied outside of the activity.

1. Voter- Decision making is the voter because debate offers a unique portable skillset. No other activity forces competitors to engage in defense of positions, refutation, and strategic thinking within time constraints. Additionally, the nature of debate makes decision making and argumentation skills its highest goal. Parcher[[9]](#footnote-9)

James McBath adds, "[a]t its essence, forensics is an educational activity which provides students with the opportunity to develop a high level of proficiency in writing, thinking, reading, speaking and listening"(p10). Debate is a uniquely beneficial educational tool in part because of the value of argumentation theory itself. The creation of an argument is one of the most complex cognitive acts that a person can engage in. Creating an argument requires the research of issues, organization of data, analysis of data, snythesization of different kinds of data, and an evaluation of information with respect to which conclusion it may point. After this process, the formulation of an argument requires the debater to consider differing methods of critiquing reason, the decision making formula, the audience and the criteria of decision making. In the end, arguments must be communicated to an audience clearly and succinctly - a difficult cognitive process requiring conversion between thought, written rhetoric and oral rhetoric. At the end, the debate itself requires the processing of other's arguments and then the reformulation and defense of one's original position.

Contingent Standards Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must only read non-contingent standards. Contingent standards are defined as alternative ethical frameworks or any substantive implication- ie. Causing presumption, permissibility, or skepticism to be true- that result from answering a framework.
2. Violation-
3. Standards
4. Strategy Skew- Contingent standards and trigger arguments hamper debater’s ability to form a strategy.
5. First, debaters are forced to be extremely cautious when answering a framework, leading me to either undercover the framework and give my opponent easy access to the framework debate or overcovering it and triggering another framework.
6. Second, there are multiple layers of the flow that my opponent can shift to next speech. This renders all of my offense on the contention useless because my opponent can shift out of it in later speeches.
7. Third, contingent standards arguments are often hidden. This means that debaters will be blindsided in later speeches by extensions of trigger type arguments, destroying in round strategy.
8. Fourth, I have to devote a significant amount of my prep to figgering out which arguments could be triggers, then generating reponses to the trigger argument while attempting to avoid it. This is detrimental to strategy, as I am forced to devote significant portions of my speech to generating lots of defense instead of making offensive arguments.

Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against their opponent to access the ballot.

1. Clash- Contingent standards detract from substantive clash. Debaters are encouraged to evade in depth comparison and discussion- both on framework level and contention level issues- by extending a myriad of contingent arguments in rebuttal speeches. This is detrimental to clash, as debaters improve at evading arguments instead of engaging in them. Clash is key to fairness because it is the only way for the judge to adjudicate the round. Without clash arguments are just ships passing in the night.
2. Reciprocity- Contingent standards skew structural reciprocity. I only have one out- the substantive contention level. However, contingent standards give my opponent at least a 2-1 advantage on outs- and under an interp justifying contingent standards they could have as many as they want. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equal level in the debate in order to compete in the round.
3. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Meta Ethics Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must not read meta-ethical arguments
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Judge Intervention- Meta ethics force judge intervention. Meta ethics only beg the question of the justification of the meta ethic, leading to meta-meta-ethics. This means that it is impossible for the judge to write a coherent ballot story for a meta-ethical framework, forcing them to intervene at one layer of the justification. Furthermore, it is ambiguous how meta-ethical theories of ontology, epistemology, action theory, semantics, and normative ethics interact. This forces intervention on the framework layer, as there is no way to resolve competing claims of “ontology comes first” or “epistemology comes first”. Preventing judge intervention is key to fairness because debate forces advance positions against their opponent. Intervention destroys fairness by arbitrarily choosing a winner, instead of voting for the better debater.
5. Clash- Meta ethics are detrimental to clash, on all layers of the debate
6. Framework Clash- They encourage debaters to make preclusionary arguments. Instead of engaging in framework comparison, the framework debate is about who comes first.
7. Contention clash- Meta-ethics bog down the debate on the framework level. Especially with the large amount of time it takes to justify a meta-ethical link chain, they are destructive to clash on the contention level.

Clash is key to fairness because it is the only way for the judge to adjudicate the round. Otherwise, arguments are just two ships passing in the night.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Meta Ethics Good

1. Interpretation- Debaters may/must have a meta ethic.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Logical Consistency- Justifying a normative ethic without meta-ethical arguments is logically incoherent. It begs the question of what justifies normative ethics in the first place. Kagan[[10]](#footnote-10) writes

I think, however, that metaethics and normative ethics do not actually have anything like this kind of independence from one another. Here is an easy example. When doing normative ethics we try to defend and justify substantive moral claims. But to do this, obviously enough, we have to have views about what it is you need to do to provide a moral claim with a good defense. That is, in doing normative ethics we will be presupposing some kind of account-either a developed one or at least a working understanding of one- of justification in ethics. But the topic of justification in ethics is itself one that actually belongs to metaethics. In short, doing normative ethics requires having views about metaethical issues. What’s more, depending on the details of your views about what counts as a good justification in ethics, it may well turn out that some substantive normative claims are easier to defend than others. So normative ethics and metaethics may not actually be independent of one another after all

Logical consistency is key to education because it encourages debaters to construct syllogistic, deep positions. Allowing illogical arguments makes the activity void of its educational value.

1. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the primary purpose of the activity. No debater will care about one win/loss when they leave debate, however the educational benefits of debating will always stay with them.

Aff Must Implement

1. Interpretation- The affirmative must defend the implementation of the resolution. To clarify, this interp doesn’t mean that the aff must specify an advocacy text, plan, etc. It only means that the aff cannot be defending only values, aims, etc.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Real World – Defending the resolution as a general principle is unrealistic; 90% of policy discussion is based on implementation Elmore[[11]](#footnote-11):

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that. In answering the question, " **decisions are not self- executing. Analysis of policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood** **What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred** analytic **alternative has been identified**?" Allison estimated that, **in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation.** Hence, in Nelson's terms, "**the core of analysis of alternatives becomes the prediction of how alternative organizational structures will behave over time**."6 But the task of prediction is vastly complicated by the absence of a coherent body of organizational theory, making it necessary to posit several alternative models of organization.

Furthermore, debate as an activity of rhetorical argumentation requires arguing about actions. Kock[[12]](#footnote-12) writes

The kind of argumentation through which we may work upon other individuals’ free choice is rhetoric. The core of rhetoric is argumentation intended to work upon other individuals’ choices regarding actions that they are free to undertake. This has been a given in the rhetorical tradition at least since Aristotle, who uses the verb bouleuein/bouleuesthai about the kind of reasoning that constitutes rhetoric. It is a word that we usually translate to ‘deliberate’ (which in itself means weighing on scales), and it is derived from boulê, a word with an original meaning of “will,” etymologically related to the Latin volo and the English will. Aristotle repeatedly insists that what we may deliberate about is only actions we may choose to undertake. As he says in the Nichomachean Ethics, III: “any particular set of men [people] deliberates about the things attainable by their own actions” (1112a). So rhetoric is debate about choosing action, and by the same token it is aimed at individuals and does not pretend to find solutions that are binding for all. (For a fuller statement of this, see Kock, in press.)

Real world is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable, pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic and frames all other arguments in the round.

1. Ground- Values/aims discussion is detrimental to turn ground.
2. Link Turns: Without defending implementation, the negative has minimal to no link turn ground. I can’t say that a change of priority in values will have a worse impact back to the aff standard, because that would rely on the implementation of the change. Link turn ground is preferable to impact turn ground, because often impact turns are either offensive or counterintuitive –ie Racism, genocide, nuke war good, etc.
3. Disads- I lose access to all disadvantage links, because that relies on aff fiat of the resolution. DA Ground is essential because it provides the negative with flexibility in strategy and debaters with engagement of a larger scope of literature.

Ground is key to fairness because debaters must be able to build and use offensive arguments to access the ballot.

1. Philosophical Lit- Only defending the aims of the resolution severly limits philosophical discussion. It excludes any ethical framework that finds value in the end states of action- meaning that not only util is excluded, but any consequentialist theory and various applied ethics arguments about the topic. Philosophical literature is key to fairness because it frames which impacts matter in the round. Exclusion of philosophical positions arbitrarily limits positions that debaters can run.
2. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Section 3: POLICY

Plans Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must affirm the resolution holistically
2. Violation- (Round specific)
3. Standards
4. Equal Research Burdens- Plan focus skews negative research burdens. The affirmative can pick from a near infinite amount of advocacies to affirm the resolution. This skews research burdens in favor of the affirmative, because I am forced to research every possible plan. This has the negative impacts of
5. Clash- Skewed research burdens take away from argument clash. I can’t formulate defensive responses and offensive turns against a plan that I have never seen within the topic literature. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact and be compared for the judge to make a fair decision. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all of debate’s educational skills of critical thinking and argument interaction, as well as furthers exploration of the literature.
6. Predictability- Unequal research burdens give the aff an advantage because their advocacy is unpredictable. This prevents me from formulating any coherent strategy against a plan and nullifies all of my pre-round preparation. Predictability is key to fairness because debaters can only craft arguments in round if they reasonably know what arguments they will debate against. Predictability is key to education because it determines which areas of the literature to learn from and allows for best argument interaction skills.

Equal research burdens are key to fairness because debaters must prepare before rounds in order to engage in equitable debate. Equal research burdens are key to education because debaters can only clash on arguments that they have researched.

1. Topic Literature- Plan focus ignores a vast majority of topic literature. Authors don’t pursue a specific policy plan, rather they discuss various advantages and disadvantages to the issue in the resolution in general. Plan focus takes a small sliver of the topic literature, and changes the resolution to a debate about the smallest areas in the literature. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it provides the basis for all topical clash.
2. Quality Ground- Plan focus skews quality of ground in favor of the affirmative. The aff gets to cherry pick their plan from the literature. Thus, the affirmative can find a plan that no author has objected to, or very few have. This skews the negative’s quality ground, because I lack access to authors in the literature that object to the aff’s plan. Quality Ground is key to fairness because debaters need good, persuasive arguments to access the ballot. Quality of ground is key to education because it allows for better argument interaction.
3. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Plans Good

1. Interpretation- The affirmative must be able to advocate a topical plan, provided they have a solvency advocate.
2. Violation- (I meet)
3. Standards
4. Depth of Discussion- Plan focus exponentially increases depth of discussion. Res focus encompasses too many issues; it is impossible to learn about all of the issues under the scope of the resolution. Plan focus solves because it focuses the debate onto a specific, important section of the topic literature. Plan focus is best for depth because it changes to round from a discussion about general ideas to specific advantages and disadvantages of a policy action. Depth of discussion is key to fairness because it allows debaters to form better preparation for substantive issues. Depth of discussion is key to education because it allows debaters to explore topical issues thoroughly. Depth outweighs breadth because one always learns more from reading one hundred pages of one book and one page of one hundred books.
5. Real World Decision Making- Plan focus best fosters real world decision making skills. Policy makers and people don’t affirm a concept in general or categorically. Rather, they look to specific actions that can achieve the end goal of affirming the initial concept or desire. Plan focus reflects real world decision making because policy makers always approach a problem area with a plan. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns about a topic. Real world decision making outweighs all other fairness claims because the topic would be a void statement if real world decision making issues are not involved in it. Real world decision making is key to education because debaters learn skills of policy implementation and critical thinking about specific plans.
6. Ground- Plan focus is best for ground because:
7. Quality Ground- The affirmative gains access to exponentially better ground. Instead of being forced to advocate the resolution holistically, the affirmative can craft a plan and form a qualitatively better argument. Quality of ground is key to fairness because debaters require good arguments to access the ballot. Quality of ground is key to education because it creates best clash and critical thinking within rounds. The affirmative gain in quality ground outweighs any possible loss of negative ground because 1) The aff ground is exponentially better. 2) The negative’s loss of general turns and arguments is negligible because they still have access to philosophical positions and challenging the aff framework. 3) The solvency advocate solves for the negative’s potential loss of ground because it provides a basis in the literature for the plan.
8. Quantity of Ground- The negative gains near infinite ground against a topical affirmative plan. The neg gains access to specific counterplans, DA’s, K’s, and turns that would be entirely unavailable to the neg in general. Quantity of ground is key to fairness because debaters require a wide variety of strategies and arguments to engage a position. Quantity of ground is key to education because an increasing number of arguments leads to more research in the literature and a variety of clash.
9. Stable Advocacy- The affirmative has to advocate the plan once they initiate plan focus. I can’t shift out of my advocacy, I can’t kick case, I am permanently stuck to advocating the plan. Stable advocacy is key to fairness because it allows debaters to formulate strategies and plan for rebuttal speeches. Stable advocacy is key to education because it centers the debate round one issue in the literature.
10. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the lasting impact of debate. No debater will care about one unfair strategy or decision after they leave the activity. Rather, they will always maintain the knowledge and skill set that debate uniquely grants them. Vote my opponent down to maintain the educational value of debate. Also, drop the debater because 1) to prevent further abuse from their strategy, and 2) because my opponent would get an unfair time tradeoff if they could just kick the abusive argument. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on unpredictable preferences of argumentation that the judge has.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Must Disclose Plan Text

1. Interpretation: Debaters may run topical plans so long as they disclose the plan text on the wiki at least 30 minutes before the round.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Predictability- Undisclosed plan texts are entirely unpredictable. There are a near infinite amount of potential advocacies in the literature. Thus, undisclosed plan texts render a plan unpredictable because there is no way that a debater could reasonably expect to debate the specific plan. Unpredictable plans have the impacts of
5. Equal Research Burdens- It is impossible for debaters to research every potential advocacy before a round. Plans that are not disclosed contribute to skewed research burdens because I am forced to prep for every unpredictable aff advocacy. Disclosing the plan at least 30 minutes before a round solves because it gives debaters time to quickly survey the literature. Furthermore, disclosing the plan will solve for all future rounds with the plan in it because the negative will have a sufficient amount of time to research the aff advocacy. Equal Research burdens are key to fairness because debaters must be able to utilize topical prep within rounds. Equal research burdens are key to education because it allows both debaters to learn and prepare for clash on specific issues.
6. Clash- Undisclosed plans eliminate all substantive clash on the level of the plan. Generic topic prep doesn’t interact with the plan and debaters rarely can come up with turns or defensive responses without exposure to the plan. This turns all educational impacts of depth of discussion and real world decision making against plans because debaters can’t access the depth if they are unaware of the plan text and it is unrealistic for policy makers to propose a plan without giving opposition time to research into the issue. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact and be compared for the judge to make a fair decision in the round. Clash is key to education because it fosters skills of argument interaction and critical thinking within rounds.
7. Strategy Skew- Unpredictable plans skew negative strategy. I lose access to all generic arguments and positions that I can use to address the resolution in general. However, a disclosed plan text gives the negative time to formulate a strategy before the round. I create a coherent strategy to approach the plan with. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against their opponent. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because debaters learn critical thinking skills when forming a strategy.

Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must enter rounds with a reasonable expectation of substantive arguments. Predictability is key to education because un-predictable strategies undermine all benefits of clash and argumentation skills that debaters learn.

1. Voter-Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Solvency Advocate

1. Interpretation: Debaters may only run topical plans if they have a solvency advocate with qualifications in the specific issue.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Topic Literature- Plans without a topical solvency advocate ignore the topic literature. This nullifies any possible pre-round prep, as there is no way to engage a plan that isn’t found within the literature. Ignoring the topic literature has the impacts of
5. Predictability- Advocacies without a solvency advocate are entirely unpredictable. There is no way that debaters could be expected to reasonably predict and prepare for positions that are not based within the literature. Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must have a reasonable idea of what arguments to expect going into a round. Predictability is key to education because it allows for topical clash. An un-predictable advocacy prevents all clash because debaters won’t have access to responses.
6. Clash- Ignoring the topic literature prevents substantive clash. Firstly, since the plan isn’t present within the literature, there is no way to gain access to responses from the literature. This prevents clash because I am forced to think of responses on the spot of an advocacy that no authors support or reject. Secondly, I lose the ability to clash on the solvency level. I can’t make indicts to solvency or refute a specific author’s argument without a solvency advocate. Preventing clash turns all educational of depth and real world decision making. Without argument clash from the literature, debaters lose the ability to formulate in depth discussions. Lack of clash hinders real world decision making processes because policy makers and people always clash and argue over the best course of action. Clash is key to fairness because arguments must interact and be compared for a judge to make a fair decision. Clash is key to education because it fosters critical thinking and argument interaction skills.
7. Ground- Without a solvency advocate in the topic literature, I lose access to all possible ground to indict the plan. I don’t have access to turn ground, solvency indicts, DA’s, critical arguments, and others because the plan isn’t present within the literature. Only by looking to the literature and finding a solvency advocate can debaters maintain an equitable distribution of ground. Ground is key to fairness because it determines arguments that I can and can’t make to access the ballot. Ground is key to education because my ability to substantively engage my opponent in arguments is a pre-requisite to all educational value of debate.

Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it is a gateway to all topic specific knowledge.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Alt Agent Fiat Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must fiat action only from the affirmative’s agent.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Equal Research Burdens- Allowing the negative to fiat action by any agent skews affirmative research burdens. The aff gains the burden to prepare for every possible agent, while the neg focuses on one. The neg further skews research burdens because the neg can cherry pick the agent. The neg can choose the agent with the least literature, and make it nearly impossible for the aff to find the neg advocacy while surveying the topic. Unequal research burdens leads to:
5. Predictability- Skewed research burdens gives the negative access to un-predictable strategies. Because the negative advocacy is a tiny portion of the literature, it is impossible for the aff to predict the neg’s agent while researching the topic. Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must have a reasonable expectation of arguments in every round. Predictability is key to education because un-predictable strategies skew in round clash and strategy building.

Equal research burdens are key to fairness because forcing one debater to do more preparation for the same reward is unfair. Equal research burdens are key to education because larger research burdens discourage debaters from actually doing work.

1. Real World Decision Making- Advocating an alternative agent is unrealistic. When policy makers and people make decisions, they take the action themselves. Policy makers don’t put the responsibility on others to solve for specific domestic issues or international problems tied to a state. Alternative agents ignore real world decision making because no other agent would be willing to solve for another’s domestic and international problems, and policy makers wouldn’t call upon action from the alternative agent. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic. Real world decision making is key to education because it teaches debaters critical thinking skills that will be relevant outside of debate.
2. Clash- Alternative agents decrease clash within the round. Alternative agents avoid clash on the affirmative’s advocacy, because the agent can solve better. Alternative agents further remove clash because the aff can’t prepare arguments for every single alternative agent. Clash is key to fairness because without clash it is impossible to form a decision for a round. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all educational skills of argument interaction and critical thinking.
3. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Multi Actor Fiat Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters may only fiat action from one agent.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Real world decision making- Fiat of action by multiple actors ignores real world decision making. It is entirely unrealistic for multiple actors to agree about one course of action. Actors have different conflicts and disagreements amongst themselves, which prevents action by a collective group of actors. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic. Real world decision making is key to education because it provides debaters with knowledge of substantive issues and teaches critical thinking skills.
5. Predictability- Fiat of multiple actors is entirely unpredictable. There are infinitely many permutations and combinations of actors that debaters could fiat. Thus, any form of multi actor fiat is always unpredictable. Unpredictability causes:
6. Prep Skew- Unpredictable arguments skew pre round preparation. Because there are infinitely many combinations of multiple actors, it is impossible to do any pre round preparation. Thus, all my work preparing for the topic becomes nullified because I couldn’t be expected to predict multiple actors. Preventing prep skew is key to fairness because preparation is a pre-requisite to all fair debate. Preventing prep skew is key to education because it allows debaters to engage in deeper substantive clash.

Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must enter rounds with a reasonable expectation of arguments. Predictability is key to education because it is a gateway to all substantive clash and designates the literature to research.

1. Reciprocity- Multi actor fiat gives debaters an un-reciprocal advantage. Firstly, there could always be some combination of actors that could solve best. This puts opponents at a disadvantage, because they will always have a solvency deficit to multi actor fiat. Multi actor fiat further harms reciprocity because it gives one debater a disproportionate amount of fiat power. Reciprocity is key to fairness because both debaters must be on an equal level to compete. Reciprocity has the greatest impact to fairness because it is a pre-requisite to all fair debate.
2. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Conditional CP Bad

1. Interpretation: Counterplans must have either a dispositional or unconditional status.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Real World Decision Making- Conditional counterplans ignore real world decision making. Policy makers and people don’t just throw away a plan when someone raises objections to it. Rather, they defend their plan of action and do comparisons on how, even if flawed, their plan is best. Conditional Counterplans are also unrealistic because authors and policy makers would not be credible if they constantly shifted their position. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic. Real world decision making is key to education because it fosters skills of critical thinking.
5. Strategy Skew- Conditional counterplans skew affirmative strategy. The aff never knows if the neg will kick the counterplan. Thus, the aff is forced to substantively answer the counterplan. The neg can become a moving target in the NR, kick the counterplan, and thus eliminate the value of the aff’s 1AR strat. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters can’t engage in the activity if they can’t form a strategy. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because it teaches debaters skills of critical thinking and argumentation when forming a strategy.
6. Advocacy Skills- Conditional counterplans harm advocacy skills. The negative can shift out of their advocacy in the next speech and back to the status quo. This is detrimental to advocacy skills because it teaches debaters to kick their advocacy, rather than defend it, if there are any issues with it. Advocacy skills are key to fairness because all substantive clash is based around an advocacy. Advocacy skills are key to education because it teaches debaters how to effectively defend a position.
7. Turn Ground- Conditional counterplans take away key aff turn ground. The aff can try to generate offense off of the CP in the 1AR and make turns. However, the negative can kick the counterplan in the NR, and thus eliminate all of the aff’s offense. Maintaining turn ground is key to fairness because debaters must have access to the ballot at all layers of the substantive flow. Maintaining turn ground is key to education because it provides debaters with a variety of responses to increase clash.
8. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Advantage CP’s Bad

1. Interp: Neg CP’s must be competitive with the aff advocacy via mutual exclusivity, not just net benefits. Its mutual exclusivity must not follow merely from its net benefits. [To clarify, the neg may not run advantage CP’s]
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Limits - skews research burdens since I can’t prepare against every single argument in the lit that’s consistent with the aff – especially true since I’m bound to topicality in terms of defending living wages, but he/she isn’t. There’s no reason why research on the aff would interact with a non-mutually exclusive counterplan outside of pure chance since authors don’t compare advantages or disads of every possible economic policy simultaneously. Limits are key to fairness since it’s the basis for all consistent pre-round prep and key to education by ensuring clash on relevant issues.
5. Voter-Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Mindset Alt Bad

1. Interpretation: Kritiks must only have policy action alternatives

* To clarify this means that debaters cannot read any mindset shift or rejection alts.

1. Violation- (Round Specific)
2. Standards
3. Link Turn Ground- Non policy alternatives eliminate all link turn ground on alts. I can’t make link turns explaining why the alt doesn’t solve for the K’s harms, because the alt is granted absolute solvency. Lack of link turn ground is uniquely bad because my opponent can always make solvency deficit claims against me while I lack access to them entirely. Link turn ground is key to fairness because debaters must have access to offense on all layers of the flow. Link turn ground is key to education because justifying exclusion of turn ground encourages debaters to run strategies that decrease the clash in debate.
4. Real World Decision Making- Mindset shift and rejection alts are unrealistic. Policy makers and people don’t just wish away the harms of an action. Rather, they pursue courses of action that could solve for harms. Non-policy alts are thus uniquely bad because the don’t actually solve for the K’s impacts. Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant to debate. Real world decision making is key to education because it fosters skills of critical thinking when forming policy actions. Real world decision making has the greatest impact to education because maintaining realistic arguments is a pre-requisite to all benefits of clash and knowledge from debate.
5. Voter-Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Must Spec A System

1. Interpretation- The affirmative must defend a specific, policy system of implementation. To clarify- under this interp the aff meets minimally with an advocacy text with a solvency advocate, or by running a full plan.
2. Violation-
3. Standards
4. Strategy Skew- Defending the resolution in general allows the aff to shift advocacy and offense in rebuttal speeches. By defending the resolution on balance, general means of implementation ,etc, the aff is free to delink negative arguments not only criticizing specific implementation but also the resolution in general by claiming that on balance its not implemented that way, the neg misunderstands the aff position, etc. This is compounded by the fact that authors in the literature don’t have a unified interpretation of implementation of the resolution, allowing the aff to sever out of common objections. Thus, neg strategy is crippled because I can’t generate new offense in the NR after the aff clarifies their position. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against their opponent to access the ballot.
5. Real World Decision Making- Defending the resolution in general is unrealistic. 90% of a policy discussion in the real world lies in implementation. Elmore[[13]](#footnote-13):

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that. In answering the question, " **decisions are not self- executing. Analysis of policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood** **What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred** analytic **alternative has been identified**?" Allison estimated that, **in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation.** Hence, in Nelson's terms, "**the core of analysis of alternatives becomes the prediction of how alternative organizational structures will behave over time**."6 But the task of prediction is vastly complicated by the absence of a coherent body of organizational theory, making it necessary to posit several alternative models of organization.

Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable, pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic and frames all other arguments in the round.

1. Topic Literature- (TOPIC SPECIFIC CARD HERE IF YOU HAVE ONE) Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic have their foundation in the literature.
2. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Must Defend Executive Branch (Foreign Policy Topics

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must specify in case the executive branch as the actor that implements the resolution.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Real World Decision Making: The resolution is a question of national security policy. Thus, the only way to engage in realistic discussion is to focus on the branch at the heart of national security decision making. Ulrich 1

The executive branch’s institutional competencies make the President the most important actor in foreign and security policy. The President alone has command of the bully pulpit to give him an unrivaled voice in policy debates. The President is also the actor in the American political system best positioned to consider the national interest. Since World War II, control over foreign and security policy has increasingly been centralized in the executive. The government’s expertise for formulating and implementing foreign and security policy is largely resident in the Department of State and DoD, with the National Security Council also assuming an increasing amount of author­ity and influence—all three components of the executive branch. Yet effective leadership is not a given. Perhaps the broadest and most common sense recommendation comes from presidential scholar Paul Quirk, who contributes the concept of “strategic competence.” Quirk argues that Presidents must have a well-designed strategy for achieving the competencies they need to lead effectively. In this view, the key competencies to be mastered are policy substance, policy process, and policy promotion. Policy expertise results from years of attentive engagement in the major national issues. The development of direct in-depth personal competence in policy areas is neces­sarily selective, but a base knowledge of the key issues is essential to the President’s recognition of the elements of responsible debate and to responsible decisionmaking.41 Anything less than this, Quirk argues, is minimalist and may impede intelligent decisionmaking. A minimalist president . . . will not fully appreciate his own limitations. By consistently neglecting the complexities of careful policy arguments, one never comes to understand the importance of thorough analysis. In politics and government, at least, people generally do not place a high value on discourse that is much more sophisticated than their own habitual mode of thought.42

Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Section 4: Topicality

Extra T Bad

1. Interpretation: The affirmative may only garner offense from topical arguments.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Equal Research Burdens- Extra topical arguments put an infinite research burden on the negative. The neg has to enter the round prepared for every possible issue, in every field of literature, that the affirmative could present. This explodes negative research burdens because the neg has to sufficiently research nearly infinitely many issues. Extra T further skews research burdens because it makes the aff’s burden comparatively easier. The affirmative cherry picks the extra topical issue, and can focus on the benefits of the extra topical action. This makes the affirmative research burden significantly easier because the aff can ignore topical research and focus on an easy to research extra topical issue. Equal research burdens are key to fairness because debaters must be able to utilize pre-round prep within debates. Equal research burdens are key to education because large research burdens discourage debaters from learning about substantive issues.
5. Depth of Discussion- Extra topical arguments harm depth of discussion on the resolution. Instead of focusing on topical issues, the affirmative can expand breadth of discussion to nearly an infinite amount of issues. This harms depth of discussion on the resolutional level because the round shifts from focus on the resolution to focus on extra topical issues. Extra topical arguments harm depth of knowledge even outside of the resolution because debaters only learn fractions of information about a wide variety of arguments, rather than having a depth of knowledge. Depth of discussion is key to fairness because it gives debaters access to the best arguments to the ballot. Depth of discussion is key to education because without depth debaters learn only about random fragments of knowledge. Depth of discussion always outweighs breadth, especially in extra topical issues, because debaters will always learn more from reading 100 pages of one book than 1 page of 100 books.
6. Topic Literature- Extra topical arguments nullify the importance of the topic literature. Debaters could enter rounds with the same extra topical case throughout the debate season, and never have to research the literature. Further, it inherently harms topical discussion because it shifts the focus of the round away from the resolution. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are found within the literature. Topic literature has the largest impact to fairness because debaters are only given the resolution before every round; The only predictable arguments to prep for are found within the literature. Topic literature is key to education because it provides a depth of knowledge unique to a two month period.
7. Clash- Extra topical arguments are detrimental to substantive clash. Debaters cannot formulate responses against random, unpredictable arguments in round. Especially with extra topical arguments, because they have no basis in the literature and the aff can pick the hardest extra topical arguments to answer, substantive clash is nearly impossible. Clash is key to fairness because without clash arguments are impossible to compare, and the judge can’t make a fair decision. Clash is key to education because it is a gateway to all educational benefits of critical thinking and argument interaction, thus outweighing all other impacts to education as well.
8. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Effects T Bad

1. Interpretation: Affirmative advocacies must only be topical through the actions of the advocacy.

* To clarify, this means that debaters cannot run effects topical arguments

1. Violation- (Round Specific)
2. Standards
3. Equal Research Burdens- Effects T arguments give the negative a near impossible research burden. The neg is forced to learn about every single possible action that could lead to the affirmation of the resolution. There are infinitely many actions that could potentially affirm, and thus the negative would have to research and prepare for nearly every advocacy. Research burdens are further skewed because the affirmative cherry picks their advocacy. The aff can choose the best effects T arguments, with a balance of good literature for the aff and bad literature for the neg. This skews research because aff research becomes much easier while the negative’s ground may not even exist. Equal research burdens are key to fairness because debaters must enter rounds able to utilize pre-round prep. Equal research burdens are key to education because large research burdens discourage debaters from actually doing preparation.
4. Topic Literature- Effects T arguments ignore the topic literature. Instead of focusing on topical issues, the aff shifts the debate to the effects topical advocacy. It further harms topical discussion because instead of focusing on the impact of the implementation of the resolution the round focuses on the impacts of the effects topical advocacy. Topic literature is key to fairness because all arguments relevant to the topic are from the literature. Topic Literature has the greatest impact to fairness because the resolution is the only thing that debaters have before rounds. Thus, prep work, casing, and strategy is centered around the topic literature. Topic Literature is key to education because ignoring the literature removes clash from the debate.
5. Predictability- Effects topical arguments are unpredictable. There are an infinite amount of potential actions or events that could lead to affirmation. The negative could not be reasonably expected to predict every possible action that could affirm. Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must have a reasonable expectation of arguments going into a round. Otherwise debaters will win by virtue of more prep on obscure issues. Predictability is key to education because the ability to predict arguments is a pre-requisite to substantive engagement. Predictability outweighs all other impacts to education because 1) What is predictable determines which areas of the topic literature that debaters will learn from an 2) Unpredictable strategies cannot be substantively engaged, thus harming skills of argument interaction and clash.
6. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational

Section 5: Meta Theory/Other

Must Be an RVI

1. Interpretation: Debaters initiating theory must grant their opponent an RVI
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Strategy Skew- Theory shells inevitably skew strategy. I don’t know if my opponent will go for theory in the next speech, and since theory comes first, I have to sufficiently cover it. My strategy is skewed because my opponent will either drop theory and go for under covered substance in the next speech, or go for theory if I insufficiently answered it. RVI’s check back for strategy skew because I can win on the theoretical level and don’t have to worry about my opponent shifting to the under covered parts of the flow. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to formulate a strategy to access the ballot. Preventing strategy skew is key to education because creating a strategy for a speech forces debaters to think critically about issue selection and time allocations.
5. Reciprocity- Without an RVI my opponent has a 2-1 advantage to me in the debate. They can win on either substance or theory, while I can only win substantively. Thus, theory must be a two way street or it is functionally a nib. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equal level to engage in competition. Reciprocity outweighs all other impacting to fairness because it is a pre-requisite to fair debate.
6. Time Skew- Without RVI’s theory is a massive time suck. I am forced to create a competing interpretation, do weighing analysis between the interpretations, and then put responses on my opponent’s interpretation. It’s impossible to sufficiently cover both the theory debate and the substantive side of the flow with time in rebuttal speeches. RVI’s check back for the time suck because it allows me to gain access to the ballot from the time I invested in the theory debate. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters need to make time allocations before they can engage in the debate. Preventing time skew is key to education because it allows debaters to further develop arguments and create more clash.
7. Substantive Clash- Theory takes away from substantive clash without an RVI. Debaters will be encouraged to run any random theory shell to force their opponent to deal with theory, so that they can’t adequately cover substance. RVI’s check back for abusive theory and increase substantive clash because debaters will make sure there is a strong theoretical violation since their opponent can win on the theoretical flow. Without an RVI theory becomes self-defeating, as it only takes away from the substantive debate instead of improving it. Substantive clash is key to fairness because the resolution is the only thing that debaters enter a round with. There could potentially be infinite theoretical violations in one case, but majority of prep is for substantive debate. Substantive clash is key to education because it provides access to topic specific knowledge and in depth clash.
8. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Positively Worded Interps

1. Interpretation: All theoretical interpretations must be positively worded.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Clear Theoretical Advocacy- Positively worded interpretations provide an alternative to rectify the abuse. Negatively worded interpretations are ambiguous and don’t actually tell debaters how to debate fairly or educationally. Since they only tell debaters what not to do, they provide no implication as to what debaters should do when debating in future rounds. Positively worded interpretations solve for the abuse in the round and in future rounds because they provide an alternative as to what the debater should have done, instead of just indicting the debater for what they did. Positively worded interpretations thus clarify theoretical advocacies because they are the only interpretation that can actually provide an advocacy. Clear theoretical advocacies are key to fairness and education because they establish the norms of how to debate fairly or educationally.
5. Real World- Policy makers and people don’t just indict practices for being bad. Rather, they provide an alternative to rectify the problem in the specific practice. Thus, positively worded interpretations are most consistent with real world standards because they provide an alternate course of action. Real World is key to fairness and education because all arguments have a foundation in the real world.
6. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Fairness is uniquely important on the theoretical level, because theory must be fair or else it is impossible to win rounds.Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Meta theory functions at a higher level than the theory debate because we must first determine the rules of theory before we can set norms for the activity.

Multiple Theory Shells Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters initiating theory may only run one theory shell.
2. Violation- (Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Time Skew- Multiple theory shells skew time in rebuttal speeches. One theory shell takes a significant amount of time to answer; I have to read a counter interpretation, do weighing analysis between interpretations, and put answers on my opponent’s interpretation. Multiple theory shells are nearly impossible to adequately cover with the time in rebuttal speeches. Time is further skewed because my opponent can turn 2 or 3 short 45 second arguments into the focus of my entire speech. Thus, my time is skewed because its already hard enough to beat back one shell in a rebuttal, let alone many. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters require the ability to make time allocations to answer arguments.
5. Strategy Skew- Multiple theory shells skew strategy. Debaters are forced to sufficiently beat back each theory shell. This turns opponents into a moving target, as they would go for the under covered shell. This skews strategy because 1) It’s impossible for debaters to form an effective strategy to answer back each theory shell and 2) Opponents would collapse onto the under covered shells and arguments, rendering the prior rebuttal speech useless. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters need to form a strategy to access the ballot.
6. Reciprocity- Multiple theory shells eliminate structural reciprocity. My opponent gets a (# of shells + substance) to 1 advantage to me in the round. I am forced to answer every theory shell, before I can even access the layer of the flow that I can access. This gives my opponent multiple unique paths to the ballot. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equitable level before they can engage in competition. Reciprocity has the greatest impact to fairness because it is a pre-requisite to all fair debate.
7. Intervention Clarity- Multiple theory shells muddle the theory debate. Even with only one shell, theory debate has a tendency to be muddled and difficult to resolve. Since theory inevitably calls for judge intervention, it is extremely important that the theory debate be clear so the judge is able to pull the trigger on theory. Multiple theory shells thus defeat the purpose of theory, as they muddle the theory debate and make it nearly impossible to resolve. Intervention clarity is key to fairness and education because muddled debates prevent debaters from setting norms for fair and educational debate.
8. Voter- Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Fairness is uniquely important on the theoretical level, because theory must be fair or else it is impossible to win rounds.Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Also, theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking actual abuse. I wouldn’t want to run theory against an abusive position if my opponent could easily win with an RVI. 2) RVI’s are logically incoherent as a principle. They turn defensive counter interpretations into offensive reasons to vote debaters down; debaters don’t just win for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s encourage debaters to bait theory. Debaters would run abusive positions, prepare for the theory debate, and then easily win rounds from an RVI.

Meta theory functions at a higher level than the theory debate because we must first determine the rules of theory before we can set norms for the activity.

Multiple Theory Shells Good

1. Interpretation: Debaters may run multiple theory shells as long as they gain a clear violation from cross examination.
2. Violation- (I meet/Round Specific)
3. Standards
4. Theoretical Ground- Restriction to only running one theory shell eliminates vast amounts of theoretical ground. Without multiple theory shells I am forced to choose which abuse to call out, and thus allow other abuse. Allowing multiple theory shells rectifies this harm by allowing me to call out all the abuse in a case or strategy. Further, my ground for argumentation should not be reduced because my opponent decided to use an abusive strategy. Reduction of theoretical ground destroys the purpose of theory debate because 1) Since theory is about setting norms, debaters will be forced to accept abusive norms. Forcing debaters to choose which shell to run justifies an abusive practice, and thus defeats the purpose of theory debate. 2) The substantive debate will still be skewed by the other abuse. Only through calling out more than one instance of abuse can theory serve its role of improving the substantive debate. Theoretical ground is key to fairness and education because it establishes what practices are fair or educational. Theoretical ground outweighs all other standards because
5. If the theory debate is skewed, it is impossible to achieve a fair or educational substantive debate.
6. Theoretical ground determines which practices are fair or educational. Thus, theoretical ground must be maintained before other arguments are impacted back to fairness or education.
7. Theory determines rules for the activity. If the process of making the rules are skewed, then the rules are also skewed. Thus, limiting theoretical ground actively causes unfair and un-educational strategies.
8. Competitive Norms- Restricting debaters to one theory shell prevents theory from setting norms for the activity. The purpose of theory debate is to establish fair and educational practices for debate. However, if debaters are restricted to support one rule at a time theory won’t actually be able to establish common conceptions of fair or educational debate. Restricting debaters to one theory shell is also bad for competitive norms because it justifies abusive practice. Debaters shouldn’t have to choose between running theory shells against multiple nibs or a prioris, and allow the other argument to remain in the debate. Rather, for theory to serve its purpose debaters must be able to establish multiple rules and call out multiple forms of abuse. Competitive norms are a pre-requisite to fairness and education because they ultimately form common conceptions of fairness and education.
9. Voter- Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Fairness is uniquely important on the theoretical level, because theory must be fair or else it is impossible to win rounds.Vote my opponent down for preventing fair debate, and to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because reasonability is based on judge preferences for argumentation and invites further judge intervention.

Meta theory functions at a higher level than the theory debate because we must first determine the rules of theory before we can set norms for the activity.

CX Checks Bad

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must allow the negative to run theory without checking in cross examination and granting the aff an “I meet” on unchecked theory
2. (Specific Violation)
3. Standards
4. Theoretical Ground- CX Checks are uniquely bad for theoretical ground because:
5. They grant the affirmative an automatic I meet on all theory that isn’t checked in cross examination. This destroys all negative theory ground because the affirmative can squirrel out of theory debates even when there is a clear violation.
6. The Affirmative can sidestep theoretical issues in cross examination. The aff can claim that a nib, a priori, or other abusive argument wasn’t in the AC and the neg misinterpreted the aff argument. Thus, CX checks defeat the purpose of theory debate as a whole. Theory can no longer check abuse because the affirmative will not be incentivized to remove abuse from a case if CX allows them to avoid theory debate.
7. The meaning of “check” is very unclear. Thus, even if the negative tries to check in cross examination, the affirmative can extend the cx checks argument and then explain how the negative insufficiently checked. This prevents me from making any theoretical arguments because I never know if I can meet the “check” that the aff proposes.
8. The affirmative’s theoretical ground becomes qualitatively better because they can prepare for the neg theory argument. The aff can use all of the neg’s prep the intercept the negative’s indict and prepare for it. This skews theory ground in favor of the aff because it gives them an advantage to prepare theory arguments, which debaters don’t have without CX checks.
9. Theoretical ground is key to education because it determines the rules for educational clash and argumentation. Theoretical ground is key to fairness because the rules must be present before debaters can engage in a competitive activity. Theoretical ground also greatest impact in terms of standards because debaters must have an understanding of the rules of debate before any impacts of fairness and education can be obtained.
10. Reciprocity- CX checks prevent structural reciprocity in theory debate. I am always forced to deal with aff theoretical indicts of neg strategy. However, the aff gains outs in the theory debate by clarifying in CX and excluding theory by extending CX checks. Reciprocity is key to education because debaters must be on an equal level before learning clash skills and engaging in the literature. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must always have competitive equity.
11. Time Skew- CX checks create unfair time tradeoffs because
12. I am forced to sufficiently clarify the interpretation in cross examination. This forces me to spend more time clarifying a theory violation than I would without CX checks. The aff can set a high standard for clarification, and thus take away from neg cx time
13. CX checks create dramatically unfair time tradeoffs on the theory debate. I lose 1-2 minutes of theory in the negative case if the affirmative can simply go up in the next speech and extend CX checks.
14. Preventing Time Skew is key to education because debaters need to have the ability to make time allocations in order to engage in substantive clash and topical discussion. Preventing time skew is key to fairness because debaters need time to cover the layers of the flow.
15. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins/losses. Vote my opponent down for harming structural fairness, and also to prevent further abuse. Evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations because of the unpredictable preferences of argumentation of the judge. Fairness outweighs education because education is a reversible harm. I can always read up on the literature later and do drills for clash, but an unfair decision is permanent.

Theory is not an RVI because 1) RVI’s prevent theory from checking abuse. I would not want to theoretically object to abusive positions if my opponent could win off of an RVI. 2) RVI’s are incoherent as a principle. They turn a defensive interpretation into an offensive reason to vote me down; debaters don’t win just for being fair or educational. 3) RVI’s are a bad norm because they encourage debaters to bait theory. If theory was an RVI there would be an incentive to run abusive positions, prepare for theory, and get an easy win on the RVI.

CX Checks Good

1. Interpretation: The affirmative may require the negative to check theoretical and topicality interpretations in cross examination, ensuring either a violation or allowing the aff to adopt the interp.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Theoretical Legitimacy- CX checks ensure that theory is used as a tool to check abuse only, rather than strategy. This is true for because 1) The aff is in a double bind on theory issues. The neg can read must/must not defend a system, implementation, etc. CX checks allows debaters to avoid this frivolous theory debates, as the aff can adopt the interp. 2) It ensures that debaters will only run theory if there is real abuse. If its true that the aff is abusive- so much so that I can’t concede the interp, then CX checks ensures that theory is only used to check back abusive positions. Theoretical legitimacy is key to fairness because it ensures that theory itself is not an abusive tool to check abusive positions.
5. Substantive Clash- Theory and topicality interpretations can have infinitely many nuances and definitions. Without the ability to adopt the interp, the aff will always be in a theory violation. This is detrimental to clash, as the neg will be encouraged to run frivolous theory to avoid engaging the aff, and the aff will have to devote a significant portion of later speeches to answering it. Additionally, substantive clash outweighs theoretical clash because A) Debaters do more pre round prep on substantive issues relevant to the topic, creating depth of discussion and B) Theory is meant to improve substantive debate, which means if theory is being used in a way detrimental to substantive clash it is going against its purpose. Substantive clash is key to fairness because it allows the judge to adjudicate the round; without clash arguments are just ships passing in the night.
6. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

Extinction Impacts Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters must not run extinction scenario impacts
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Real World Decision Making: Focusing on evading extinction is an unrealistic way to make decisions. Any small action could lead to a catastrophie; and thus we should exclude catastrophic impacts, or else cause policy paralysis. **Hansson[[14]](#footnote-14):**

However, it would not be feasible to take such possibilities into account in all decisions that we make. In a sense, any decision may have catastrophic unforeseen consequences. If far-reaching indirect effects are taken into account, then – given the unpredictable nature of actual causation – almost any decision may lead to a disaster. In order to be able to decide and act, we therefore have to disregard many of the more remote possibilities. Cases can also easily be found in which it was an advantage that far-fetched dangers were not taken seriously. One case in point is the false alarm on so-called polywater, an alleged polymeric form of water. In 1969, the prestigious scientific journal Nature printed a letter that warned against producing polywater. The substance might "grow at the expense of normal water under any conditions found in the environment," thus replacing all natural water on earth and destroying all life on this planet. (Donahoe 1969 ) Soon afterwards, it was shown that polywater is a non-existent entity. If the warning had been heeded, then no attempts would have been made to replicate the polywater experiments, and we might still not have known that polywater does not exist. In cases like this, appeals to the possibility of unknown dangers may stop investigations and thus prevent scientific and technological progress. We therefore need criteria to determine when the possibility of unknown dangers should be taken seriously and when it can be neglected. This problem cannot be solved with probability calculus or other exact mathematical methods. The best that we can hope for is a set of informal criteria that can be used to support intuitive judgment. The following list of four criteria has been proposed for this purpose. (Hansson 1996) 1. Asymmetry of uncertainty: Possibly, a decision to build a second bridge between Sweden and Denmark will lead through some unforeseeable causal chain to a nuclear war. Possibly, it is the other way around so that a decision not to build such a bridge will lead to a nuclear war. We have no reason why one or the other of these two causal chains should be more probable, or otherwise more worthy of our attention, than the other. On the other hand, the introduction of a new species of earthworm is connected with much more uncertainty than the option not to introduce the new species. Such asymmetry is a necessary but insufficient condition for taking the issue of unknown dangers into serious consideration. 2. Novelty: Unknown dangers come mainly from new and untested phenomena. The emission of a new substance into the stratosphere constitutes a qualitative novelty, whereas the construction of a new bridge does not. An interesting example of the novelty factor can be found in particle physics. Before new and more powerful particle accelerators have been built, physicists have sometimes feared that the new levels of energy might generate a new phase of matter that accretes every atom of the earth. The decision to regard these and similar fears as groundless has been based on observations showing that the earth is already under constant bombardment from outer space of particles with the same or higher energies. (Ruthen 1993) 3. Spatial and temporal limitations: If the effects of a proposed measure are known to be limited in space or time, then these limitations reduce the urgency of the possible unknown effects associated with the measure. The absence of such limitations contributes to the severity of many ecological problems, such as global emissions and the spread of chemically stable pesticides. 4. Interference with complex systems in balance: Complex systems such as ecosystems and the atmospheric system are known to have reached some type of balance, which may be impossible to restore after a major disturbance. Due to this irreversibility, uncontrolled interference with such systems is connected with a high degree of uncertainty. (Arguably, the same can be said of uncontrolled interference with economic systems; this is an argument for piecemeal rather than drastic economic reforms.) It might be argued that we do not know that these systems can resist even minor perturbations. If causation is chaotic, then for all that we know, a minor modification of the liturgy of the Church of England may trigger a major ecological disaster in Africa. If we assume that all cause-effect relationships are chaotic, then the very idea of planning and taking precautions seems to lose its meaning. However, such a world-view would leave us entirely without guidance, even in situations when we consider ourselves well-informed. Fortunately, experience does not bear out this pessimistic worldview. Accumulated experience and theoretical reflection strongly indicate that certain types of influences on ecological systems can be withstood, whereas others cannot. The same applies to technological, economic, social, and political systems, although our knowledge about their resilience towards various disturbances has not been sufficiently systematized.

Real world decision making is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable and pragmatic concerns relevant ot the topic. Real World Decision making is key to education because it teaches debaters how to approach and evaluate policy discussions.

1. Logical consistency- Extinction scenarios encourage illogical practices. We look to the scenarios based off of an appeal to authority; we wouldn’t evaluate nuclear war impacts if a debater composed it of original analysis; but rather we trut expert authority. In fact, these experts are no better at making predictions than we are at guessing. Additionally, reject long link chains based on the predictions of various authors. Menand[[15]](#footnote-15) explains

It is the somewhat gratifying lesson of Philip Tetlock’s new book, “Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?” (Princeton; $35), that people who make prediction their business—people who appear as experts on television, get quoted in newspaper articles, advise governments and businesses, and participate in punditry roundtables—**are no better than the rest of us**. When they’re wrong, they’re rarely held accountable, and they rarely admit it, either. They insist that they were just off on timing, or blindsided by an improbable event, or almost right, or wrong for the right reasons. They have the same repertoire of self-justifications that everyone has, and are no more inclined than anyone else to revise their beliefs about the way the world works, or ought to work, just because they made a mistake. No one is paying you for your gratuitous opinions about other people, but the experts are being paid, and Tetlock claims that **the better known and more frequently quoted they are,** **the less reliable their guesses about the future are likely to be**. The accuracy of an expert’s predictions actually has an inverse relationship to his or her self-confidence, renown, and, beyond a certain point, depth of knowledge. People who follow current events by reading the papers and newsmagazines regularly can guess what is likely to happen about as accurately as the specialists whom the papers quote. Our system of expertise is completely inside out: it rewards bad judgments over good ones. “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. **Tetlock is a** psychologist—he teaches at **Berkeley [psychologist] —and his conclusions are based on a** long-term study that he began **twenty year***s* **[study]** ago**.** He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. **By the end** of the study**,** in 2003, **the experts had made 82**,361 **[thousand] forecasts.** Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate.**Tetlock** got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, economic growth), or less of something (repression, recession). And he **measured his experts on** two dimensions:howgood they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and **how accurate they were at predicting** specific **outcomes. The results were unimpressive**. On the first scale, **the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability** to all three outcomes—if they had given **each possible future** a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. **Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world**, in other words, **are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices**.

Logical consistency is key to education because when we make an appeal to authority we deliberately misunderstand them, harming our knowledge of the topic and creating a ruse of progress.

1. Voter- Education is the voter because it is the primary purpose of the activity. No debater will care about abusive arguments or strategies, or one win/loss after they leave the activity. However, they will always retain the education benefits of debate.

If Cap Must Spec Alt

(ORIGINALLY WRITTEN BY MICAH ROSEN)

1. Interp: If a debater reads a role of the ballot or alternative challenging capitalism, they must specify what alternative to capitalism they advocate.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Strat skew – no alternative makes the impact and alternative debate impossible since I’m comparing cap to a non-existent system. If I critique socialism, you could link out and say you don’t defend that, argue I don’t understand cap’s rejection, etc. Key to fairness since you can delink all my offense to the ballot. Independent of the standard, this turns the K
   1. It shuts of advocates to anti-cap since nobody knows what might ensue. Specing means you can compare systems in a way to rid worrying uncertainty, means revolution is impossible
   2. Strat skew prevents the discussion of the critical arguments you endorse. If you delink all my turns, I have no incentive to engage with the alt and how we deal with capitalism
   3. Turns solvency – overcoming cap is one part of the equation, but the only way to avoid collapsing back into cap/the norm, we must discuss the viability of certain alternatives. Animal Farm proves lack of an established system reaffirms oppression
   4. Precludes your analysis about why capitalism is bad – normative badness assumes a comparison between two worlds, one worse than the other – this means we can’t evaluate the K unless you specify an alternative
5. Utopian fiat – you get to wish away capitalism ignoring both all the after-effects and without the possibility of a return to capitalism. Simply rejecting capitalism ignores every necessary step it takes to get there, both through methods and after-effects. This controls the internal link to reciprocity since you side-step potential criticism, harming fairness by letting you fiat the best possible policy. Turns the K
   1. Makes it impossible to take your position seriously – you don’t have to change your position, but adapting it to a real-world perspective is a precursor to carrying out anti-capitalism
   2. Constrains how your impacts function within society – utopian positions have no effect since we can reject cap as much as we want, but if we don’t replace it with a system then cap’s rejection becomes meaningless in the real-world

And, my interp is uniquely key to critical thinking since it forces us to brainstorm how to shape and impact society as we dismantle capitalism. He/she harms critical thinking by ignoring this discussion, which turns their ROB

1. Critical thinking is what allows us to challenge the status quo and entrenched oppression – the reason capitalism has become so bad is we lack the ability to think about the best possible system and critique all oppressive ones, which means spec’ing an alternative gives us skills to enforce anti-oppression
2. Critical thinking is key to dismantling capitalism – we have to identify both what is capitalist and how to target and take down capitalism, both which require interrogation and critical thinking, so my interp is a prerequisite

Voter is fairness – your position assumes the importance of equal advantage and non-exploitation, making fairness a prerequisite – worse since it’s a direct violation, not a mindset

RVI On I Meets Bad

1. Interpretation- Debaters must not make arguments for RVI’s from I meets on theory interpretations or try to access offense from meeting a theory interp.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Logical Consistency- Allowing RVI’s on I meets encourages debaters to make conflationary arguments. An I meet is a defensive argument- It only says that a debater is consistent with an interp. Thus, an RVI from an I meet conflates a purely defensive argument with an offensive reason to vote debaters down. Logical consistency is key to fairness because illogical arguments prevent the judge from forming a coherent ballot story, encouraging intervention. Logical consistency is key to education because it encourages debaters to construct syllogistic, in depth positions.
5. Theoretical Ground- RVI’s on I meets deter me from checking abuse. This is true becase
6. Debaters running abusive arguments often prep out lists of I meets. This functionally puts a nib on me for every I meet that is read to answer it or else I lose the debate. Thus, it becomes entirely unstrategic to use theory as a recourse to abuse
7. Many abusive arguments are innovated throughout the season, and framing an interpretation against them can be difficult. This rewards innovative abusive debaters, and forces me to engage on the substantive layer unless I have 100% confidence I have crafted a solid interp.

Theoretical ground is key to fairness and education because it provides debaters with the ability to construct norms for the activity.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

AC Spikes Must be Paradigmatic

1. Interpretaiton – the Affirmative must only include paradigmatic theory spikes in the AC, meaning reasons why theory is drop the arg/debater, competing interps/reasonability, and RVI’s. The AC cannot have other theory spikes or defend explicit interps
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Neg Flex – AC spikes destroy negative flexibility. The aff can read any no risk interp in their case and I’m forced to engage in them before I can access offense. And it doesn’t matter that I can debate under your interps – in your world the aff reads theory spikes that prevent the neg from generating effective offense. Neg flex is key to fairness because it ensures that the neg can check the aff’s prep advantage and develop substantive strategies.
5. Norms – spikes in the AC harm norming for two reasons

a) Theoretical spikes lead to lower quality norms. The aff fills the AC with a variety of theory arguments to increase the probability that the neg undercovers or drops one. This prevents norm setting, as theory is decided by tech of a spike being dropped rather than the truth of an interp

b) Reading interps and offensive theory in the 1AR is key to check back real abuse. If the aff’s spikes are actually good for debate there’s no reason they need to start the theory debate in the AC. Reading theory in the 1Ar is key to ensure the shells aren’t frivolous, as the 1AR is time crunched and can’t waste time on arguments with a low probability of accessing the ballot

Norms are key to any voter because it ensures effective enforcement of theoretical rules and that theory debates are resolvable.

Section 6: Answers To Various Arguments

AT: RVI Good

AT: RVI because of Time Investment

1. Turn: RVI’s are worse for time tradeoffs and investment because they encourage debaters to go all in on theory. Thus- debaters are left with often a single out when theory is an RVI when they could have had multiple substantively without over-investing.
2. All arguments cause some degree of time skew. Just because my opponent needs to invest time on the theoretical layer doesn’t justify why it is a voter.
3. I also had to invest a considerable amount of time to run theory. My opponent can easily win the time tradeoff with I meets, smart counter interps, etc.

AT: RVI for Reciprocity

1. Turn: This decreases reciprocity as it gives my opponent an additional out on the theory debate. This means that they have a unrecirprocal advantage- as they can win the round through justifying a counter interp, substantively, or a new shell.
2. Theory is already reciprocal- no RVI’s set the same standards for both debaters. We both have the same access to offense on the theoretical layer, if my opponent wanted to generate offense on theory they could just read an offensive theory shell.

AT: RVI Deters frivolous Theory

1. Turn: RVI’s encourage more in depth, nuanced frivolous theory shells. Debaters will just prep more on their favorite frivolous theory debate- nullifying the value of the RVI.
2. This is empirically denied. Debaters run frivolous theory all the time with the risk that their opponent could win an RVI. And frivolous theory already is extremely vulnerable to RVI’s, as judges often dislike frivolous theory, meaning that there is not a deterrent effect.
3. I’ve shown that there is actual abuse in this round, which has significant ramifications for my substantive strategy. This means that even if there is a risk that RVI’s check back for frivolous theory- since my theory isn’t frivolous my opponent shouldn’t get an RVI

AT: RVI Or else theory is No Risk

1. Turn: This creates a worse norm for debate as it makes abuse a no risk issue. Debaters can freely run abusive positions because either their opponent won’t initiate theory because of the chance of an RVI or they do initiate theory, and the abusive debater has a prepped counter interp.
2. Theory is not no risk. Running theory arguments open me up to meta-theory, various K’s of theory, judge intervention because of the nature of theory debates, etc.
3. Even if theory is no risk, it is comparatively better to have a world of debate where we can check abuse, even if the recourse itself is slightly abusive, than a world without theory because of the deterrence of RVI’s.

AT: RVI Bad

No RVI because deters check abuse

1. Turn: This is a reason why theory has to be an RVI to make sure that people are confident when they initiate the theory debate that there is actual abuse in the round.
2. Turn: This argument ignores the purpose of theory, which is to check abuse, and instead frames it as a strategic tool. In order to check back theory merely used for strategy theory must be an RVI.
3. Just because theory can be an RVI doesn’t mean you automatically lose the theory debate; the neg still has to win both that theory is an RVI and offense back to their interpretation before I can win on the theoretical layer of the flow. Thus, there is no deterrent because if there is actual abuse then you will be ahead on theory.

No RVI because turns defense into offense

1. RVI’s don’t turn defense into offense because they require that I have to win offense back to my interpretation. I am proving that my counter interpretation is better with offensive reasons, avoiding conflation.
2. My opponent can win the round by proving that my interp is bad for debate; there is no reason why I shouldn’t be able to also win by proving that their interpretation is worse.
3. \*\*\*If applicable- The counter interpretation is offensively worded, so it doesn’t turn defense into offense.

No RVI because Bait Theory

1. Turn: The aff is on a double bind on a lot of theory issues- ie. Must defend implementation, plan, etc, which means that smart affs will prep on theory issues. Not granting RVI’s because
2. This is only a potentially abusive way to use the RVI, and thus shouldn’t be a reason why I can’t have access to it.
3. The implication of this argument is that debaters shouldn’t prep on theory issues. This creates a worse norm for debate by giving a permanent advantage to debaters who initiate the theory debate and skewing my strategy and time by forcing me to create counter interpretations and answers to theory arguments on the spot.

AT: Drop The Argument

Dropping argument eliminates frivolous theory/makes sure only checks abuse

1. Turn: Dropping the argument encourages frivolous theory because it makes theory a no risk issue. Thus, debaters are encouraged to read multiple, blippy theory shells because they cannot lose the round from an RVI
2. Debaters don’t lose an incentive to read frivolous theory, it will just shift the frivolous theory arguments read. Frivolous theory will become more inclusive of entire positions or advocacies, functionally becoming drop the debater again.

Drop Argument allows more substantive Clash

1. Turn: Drop the argument skews substantive clash and strategy because I never know if I’m going to win the theory debate. This means that I will still have to engage the abusive argument on the substantive level, harming substantive clash.
2. Turn: Theoretical clash is good. Theory allows debaters to engage in nuanced comparison of interpretations, and encourages critical thinking skills by forming counter interps on the spot, weighing between standards, etc.
3. Turn: Dropping the argument muddles the substantive layer. It is ambiguous what happens when an argument is dropped- especially if theory is ran against the entire aff advocacy or an entire position. This muddles and confuses the substantive debate, instead of improving it.

Disproportionate to the abusive argument Read to drop the debater

1. Turn: Dropping the argument forces me to invest a disproportionate amount of time in theory to get rid of tiny, abusive arguments. I have to spend at least a minute of my speech developing clear standards, voters, and other theoretical issues. Thus, the only proportional implication of theory is drop the debater.
2. There is no brightline to when dropping the argument/debater will be proportional. Prefer dropping the debater because it creates a consistent norm for evaluating theory debates, while basing the impact of theory directly proportional to the abuse creates arbitrary judge intervention, as they must determine proportionality.

AT: Drop The Debater

AT: Deterrence

1. This is empirically denied- debaters still run a prioris, nibs, and various other abusive argument despite theory being available as a tool to check abuse.
2. Turn: It encourages debaters to run abusive strategies and prep the theory debate. Debaters will run abusive arguments, and since theory is drop the debater, often center their strategy on collapsing on theory and going for an RVI.

AT: Debaters Will Bait Theory if drop the argument

1. Turn: It becomes unstrategic to run abusive positions because dropping the argument eliminates the ability to access an RVI. This makes theory against abuse no risk- discouraging abusive arguments.

AT: Time Tradeoff

1. Turn: Dropping the argument is better for time tradeoffs because debaters won’t have to invest as much time in their shell. Because of the high probability that opponents will concede the shell, dropping the argument shortens time spent on theory and gives more time in later speeches to devote to substance.
2. Turn: This argument misconstrues the purpose of theory. Theory is not a strategic tool; it is meant to check back bad norms for the activity. Its better to make theory less strategic, to ensure its only used to check back abuse.

AT: Reasonability Good

AT: Race to the Top With Competing Interps

1. Turn: A race to the top is good. Competing interpretations ensures that debate is optimally fair and educational, creating the best norms for the activity.
2. Turn: The race to the bottom that reasonability creates is comparatively worse. Even if competing interps could marginally increase theory debates because of a race to the top, reasonability encourages debaters to be as minimally reasonable as possible. This increases the overall quantity of theory without the norm setting effect of competing interps.

AT: Prevents Bad Theory/Frivolous Theory

1. Turn: Reasonability encourages frivolous theory because it lowers the burden of proof for the debater initiating theory. Instead of having to prove nuanced reason why their interp is better, debaters initiating theory only have to prove that their opponent’s strategy is minimally unreasonable.
2. Turn: It increases overall quantity of theory debates in the long term because of the arbitrariness of reasonability. Since reasonability begs the question of what is reasonable, individual judges will have to intervene for either debater. This creates more theory, as theory as evaluated inconsistently and doesn’t create norms.

AT: Encourages Substantive Clash

1. This is empirically denied, as most debaters that appeal to reasonability still read a counter interpretation. Thus, loss of substantive clash is non-unique under either paradigm of evaluating theory.
2. Turn: Reasonability is net bad for clash in the debate by sidestepping theoretical clash. Instead of engaging in warrants of standards, weighing, and comparison, debaters sidestep theory issues by just claiming they are reasonable. This eliminates most theoretical clash- which is uniquely valuable as it encourages on the spot critical thinking to make counter interps and interp comparison, instead of just reading prepped substantive blocks.

AT: AEC Good

AEC increases clash (often contention specific)

1. AEC has no impact on clash. Debaters can read offcase positions; ie disads, counterplans, K’s, etc. that link to the aff framework, and win the round without ever putting ink on the aff contention.
2. Turn: AEC is harmful to clash because there is no brightline for when a debater is reconceptualizing the aff framework, and thus violating AEC. This forces debaters answering aff contentions to be walking on pins and needles, as they aren’t sure if a turn or defensive response will trigger a violation of AEC
3. Turn: AEC is bad for clash because it creates extremely repetitive debates. If AEC was accepted as a norm, then there would only be a limited amount of aff positions with theoretically legitimate frameworks to read AEC with. This creates repetitive debates, thus decreasing and devaluing the clash from the activity.
4. Turn: AEC decreases clash because the aff could choose any framework. This eliminates clash in the debate, as the aff could AEC an obscure framework, eliminating the negative’s recourse against this strategy by reading a negative case.

AEC best represents the literature

1. Turn: AEC excludes topic literature because it limits the scope of impacts that matter .This excludes extremely relevant impacts and arguments to the topic, lowering topic specific education and access to the literature.
2. Turn: A lot of the topic literature consists of applied ethics arguments specific to the topic. AEC thus ignores much of the literature, as it prohibits debaters from reading different applied ethics arguments and comparing them to the aff framework.
3. Turn: Its unrealistic that any author would say that the only thing that matters to a topic is util, the law, etc. Thus, AEC bastardizes the topic literature by misrepresenting the way that academics engage in debate.

AEC checks back for Side Bias

1. Turn: AEC tips the scale too far in favor of the affirmative. If it was a rule for debate- AEC would allow affirmatives to only have to research a sliver of the literature, and they would have a massive prep advantage over negative debaters. Instead of balancing side biases, AEC gives an Aff side bias by only allowing the negative to engage in the aff’s ballpark.
2. Turn: Often, a majority of the topic literature or real world arguments conclude clearly to one side under a moral framework. This skews side bias in favor of the affirmative, as they can pick a framework that has minimal to no neg ground.
3. Turn: Justifying practices based off side bias creates bad norms for the activity, as one side will always have an advantage over the other under any set of norms .This proliferates theory debates, as one side will always be trying to rectify side bias instead of actually talking about the topic.
4. ----Also read various defensive arguments against aff side bias.

AEC Solves back for phil education with Framework Justifications

1. Turn: Reading framework justifications under AEC is bad for philosophical education. It allows for the advancement of underwarranted, poor, and misrepresented philosophical arguments that both debaters are forced to accept as true.
2. This doesn’t solve back- philosophical education comes from answering framework, defending framework, and engaging in comparison of philosophical warrants. Just reading blips of philosophy doesn’t provide important philosophical education.

AT: Plans Good

Stable Advocacy

1. Turn: Plan focus increases the affirmative’s ability to sever out of arguments. Since neither myself or the judge is an expert on the implementation of the plan, the aff is free to sever out of neg objections by clarifying the advocacy, means of implementation, etc in the next speech.
2. Turn: Defending the resolution as a whole creates a more stable advocacy by having the aff defend the entire scope of the literature. It is by definition impossible to sever and shift advocacy if the aff is bound to defend everything.

Depth of Discussion

1. Turn: Plan focus discourages depth by shifting the debate away from where the negative is prepped. A majority of topic prep goes into arguments interacting with the resolution in general, creating more depth than a debate where the negative can only make one or two analytical turns to the plan.
2. This depth is non-unique to res focus. The same level of depth can be achieved by running an affirmative with advantages that have links to specific systems, or nuanced link chains.
3. Turn: Plans are bad for depth because not all teams or debaters would read the same plan if the aff interp was adopted. This creates a shallow discussion of issues, as the negative has to do an extremely large amount of prep against multiple potential aff plans, skewing my ability to focus on one topic area.

Real World Decision Making

1. Turn: LD specific plan debate is unrealistic. Even if policy discussion is only based on advocacy- real world policies don’t structure advantages that say if this policy isn’t enacted there will be imminent extinction.
2. Turn: Debate type plans ignore and create unrealistic policy discussion. While policy may be about plans, its not only focused on the impacts of enacting it. Real world policy scrutinizes the states ability to implement the plan, funding for the plan, which branch of government will implement, etc. The aff bypasses this valuable discussion with fiat power.
3. Turn: In the real world most policy makers base decisions around personal or party values. Regardless of whether or not a plan would have great benefits, policy discussions often come down to competing philosophies and general principles.

I disclosed it so it is predictable!

1. Most circuit debate tournaments have at least 100 participants. This means that disclosing won’t benefit negative’s against plans, as the negative can’t prep out equally 100 affirmative positions. Even if I can know after postings come out that I will debate you, and that your wiki has a plan disclosed, I won’t have enough time to catch up on prep and generate meaningful strategy.
2. This argument doesn’t solve back for the abuse from the predictability standard. Plans create a bad norm for debate because by examining the literature it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to predict and prep all aff plans. Predictability isn’t about whether there are outside factors influencing whether or not I know the case will be read- only about whether I could know from reading the lit that it was coming.

AT: Plans Bad

Predictability

1. Turn: Plans are better for in round predictability because they lock down my advocacy. This prevents me from shifting and severing out of any neg arguments because I am forced to defend the plan, where when affirmatives defend the res. On balance they have leeway. And this predictability outweighs preround predictability and prep because regardless of how much prep debaters can do, the ability to sever out of arguments nullifies it.
2. The solvency advocate in the plan checks back for predictability. Since my plan has a solvency advocate explicitly saying it should be implemented, then it is a reasonably predictable argument from the literature.
3. Predictability is non-unique to stock, whole res affirmatives. The aff can read specific advantages, a myriad of frameworks, etc. Thus, adopting this interpretation of debate doesn’t increase overall predictability.

Ground

1. Turn: Ground is qualitatively better because debaters can access in depth arguments against the plan. Instead of debating vague link stories about the resolution, both debaters can read specific evidence directly addressing the plan, creating qualitatively better debate.
2. Turn: Quality of ground also increases with plan focus. The Neg gains access to a large amount of counterplans, kritiks, and disadvantages that all link to the plan. Thus, plans are better for ground as they grant the neg with access to a larger amount of strategic options to engage the plan.
3. Turn: Even if plans prevent access to some ground, they focus debate on valuable ground. Plans ensure that debates clash over real world issues- which is comparatively the best ground as it ensures that our knowledge and skillset from debate is portable outside the activity.

AT: Nibs Good

Real World Decision Making

1. Turn: Nibs create an unrealistic approach to discussion of the resolution. Policy makers don’t delay policy because they can’t disprove moral skepticism, respond to nihilism, etc. Thus, the norm of nibs, even if the specific nib in the round isn’t philosophical, creates a worse real world discussion.
2. Turn: Real world decisions are about comparison. People don’t set up absolute conditions of sufficiency for one side of an argument to be true, rather they compare the advantages and disadvantages to both sides. Nibs skew real world discussion because they turn an advantage or disadvantage into a non-comparative, substantive gateway issue for that debater.

Topic Lit/philosophical lit

1. Turn: Nibs detract from exploration of philosophical and topic specific issues because they spread the discussion too thin across multiple layers. Instead of engaging in valuable weighing, evidence comparison, and other in depth discussions, nibs force debaters to shallowly answer arguments to secure coverage.
2. Topical and philosophical education can be achieved out of round. Debaters can always read about the topic to learn about a myriad of topic specific issues, or take a philosophy class. Thus, the potential risk of educational benefit from a nib/nibs are not unique to debate.

Hey you can read a nib too!

1. Turn: (If aff) I didn’t read a nib in my initial constructive, and couldn’t read one in the 1AR because it would be new. Thus, the negative is actively decreasing reciprocity by reading a nib when the aff already denied both debaters access to nibs by not reading any in the constructive.
2. Turn: This creates a worse norm for debate because it makes debates irresolvable. Debaters can’t compare nibs, forcing judges to arbitrarily intervene. Furthermore, attempts of this comparison would be irresolvable because it would devolve into chicken and egg type arguments about which comes first.

AT: Multiple Theory Shells Bad

Strategy Skew

Time Skew

Reciprocity

AT – Weigh against presumption

1. Interpretation – The affirmative must not require the negative to weigh abuse against presumption or side bias, or read (read their spike).
2. Violation – Its in the aff, CX, etc
3. Standards
4. Reciprocity – The aff gains an unreciprocal advantage as I have to weigh abuse claims against presumption but they don’t have to show why their interps solve for side bias or don’t push side bias too far in favor of the aff. Additionally the spike becomes a nib for me as I both have to win a valid abuse claim and then weigh that claim against side bias Reciprocity is key to fairness because it ensures that debaters are on an equitable level and the judge can accurately determine the better debater.
5. Recourse – (if they say you need empirics) Their interps eliminates all recourse as no empirics exist about how specific theoretical interps affect side bias. This means that the aff can defend any interp in their world regardless of its impact on debate, and I lose any risk of checking abuse. Recourse is key to any voter because it ensures that both sides have access to offensive theory and norms can be set for the activity.

Two Shells No RVI ok

1. Counter interp – Debaters may read a maximum of two theory shells without granting their opponent the RVI
2. I meet
3. Standards
4. Recourse – two shells are key to access in round recourse because debaters are prepped with counter interps on abusive arguments, so even if I am on the right side of the issue they will still win the theory debate by collapsing on one shell with an RVI. Two shells are key to solve as it ensures that debaters make the highest quality arguments on both interps so we can accurately evaluate practices.

Recourse is key to any voter because it provides access to offensive theory to combat unfair or uneducational practices. And recourse outweighs all other standards loss of recourse makes it impossible for me to combat abusive strategies. Even if you are slightly disadvantaged without the RVI, a world of no theory is comparatively worse.

1. Norms – two shells without an RVI is key to produce effective norms
2. Your interp slows norming by forcing me to read one theory shell at a time. *Even if it’s possible to read two that’s never strategic because I put two nibs on myself and have to win both.* Thus you proliferate abuse across the season instead of phasing it out quickly
3. My interp ensures that the best quality arguments are made by both sides on each theory shell given time restrictions introduced by reading two shells. My interp produces better norms because we evaluate the highest quality arguments.
4. Your interp proliferates arbitrary rules on the theory debate. There’s no reason that two shells one standard long would be more abusive than one six standard shell without an RVI, and you cause people to draw arbitrary bright lines such as x amount of shells bad. *And it doesn’t matter that I do this in the counter interp – your interp forced me to frame mine like yours to answer it.*

Norms are key to fairness and education because they ensure the implementation of theory rules and govern the macro level accuracy of interps.

Implicit Counter Interp

1. Interpretaiton – NC theory is offensive when initiated, the aff cannot say that all neg interps are just counter interps to AC stances.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Reciprocity – implicit counter interps give the aff an unreciprocal advantage on the theory debate. The aff gets exclusive access to offensive theory, and I can only win through an RVI on any theory shell. Furthermore the 1AR can expand with new interps that I can’t read in the NC. Reciprocity is key to fairness because it ensures that debaters are on an equal level so the judge can determine the better debater.
5. Recourse – (their spike) prevents the neg from accessing theoretical recourse because
6. I don’t know the exact text of the explicit interps in the AC – ie whether they defend plans good in general or plans with a solvency advocate good. This prevents me from generating a theoretical strategy in the AC and allows the 1AR to sever out of theoretical indicts.
7. I have to win on two layers to win theory – the RVI and my shell – while the aff only has to win one. This makes theory against abusive affs unstrategic and forces me into a skewed substantive layer.

Recourse is key to any voter because it ensures that both debaters have access to offensive theory and can set norms for the activity.

Pic Solvency Advocate

1. Interpretation- If the negative reads a pic then the neg must have a solvency advocate, defined as an author with a scholarly degree in a relevant field to the topic that advocates for the explicit counterplan text. To clarify – advocating for the ocunterplan text can’t just be evidence that says the pic has benefits, rather the neg must read evidence where the author advocates for the direct text of the pic. To meet my interp, the solvency advocate would need to say we should have living wages in all instances except [whatever the pic said]
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Predictability- solvency advocates are the only way that pics have a chance to be predictable. Otherwise the neg could pic out of a tiny part of the aff advocacy, leaving me no way to know what the neg will fiat and thus deny me the ability to do prep. By ensuring that the advocacy is in the lit, solvency advocates ensure that the pic is predictable. Predictability si key to fairness because debaters must have a reasonable expectation of arguments that are going to be made in the round.
5. Real world – solvency advocates ensure that the advocacy is realistic. Otherwise debaters could make up whatever pic or advocacy they wanted. The literature ensures that the pic being discussed is a real world policy option, which is key to accessing the educational benefits of pics. Real world is key to fairness because it is the source of all predictable pragmatic concerns relevant to the topic.

No Offense From Discussion

1. Interpretation- Debaters introducing a role of the ballot of (x) can only garner offense through the efficacy of the kritik alternative and impacts, and cannot get offense from initiating or participating in a discussion.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Strat Skew – You have a layer of weighing that I can’t access, even if can get offense on the K you can eliminate it by saying that you caused the discussion to happen in the first place. This allows the k debater to eliminate all turns to the position; preventing strat skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against their opponent to access the ballot.
5. Inclusion – Offense through discussion kills inclusion, because the negative will always be the first to initiate discussion of its type of pre fiat impacts. Pre fiat affs don’t solve – you cant just focus on alternative forms of oppression and introduce discussion. Inclusion is key to fairness because it ensures that I can make offensive arguments and compare my advocacy. Also link turns your efficacy arguments because under your model of debate I have a strong incentive not to participate in the discussion to avoid giving you offense.
6. Voter – fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins an losses.

Descriptive Standards Good

1. Counter-Interpretation – The affirmative may read a descriptive standard (of consistency with legal contracts)
2. I meet
3. Standards
4. Philosophical Literature- The neg’s interp destroys access to phil lit
5. You take out any moral theory that views laws as important, because they are descriptive in nature
6. All means based standards are excluded under their interp because they say descriptively that one form of action is immoral, or rely on a descriptive side constraint
7. The only standards that could be read are ones about predictive consequences – because those contention impacts are the only ones that have a chance of not being fact.

Philosophical lit is key to fairness because it frames what impacts matter in the round. Philosophical lit is key to education because it teaches debaters about philosophical issues and critical thinking. Philosophical lit has the greatest impact back to education because 1) It encourages deeper critical thinking and clash. philosophical clash allows debaters to deeply examine and compare competing values. 2) Philosophical clash is unique to LD debate. If debaters only wanted to learn about policy issues, they would do policy debate or pofo. However, debaters do LD because it is a unique forum for philosophical discourse and comparison unavailable anywhere else

1. Voter – education is the voter because it is the primary purpose of debate; no one cares about one win or loss once they leave the activity but they value the skills they gain. Education outweighs fairness a) it’s a prerequisite to debate; schools wouldn’t fund an uneducational activity. b) Education allows debaters to solve for unfairness – with better critical thinking skills and strategy debaters can overcome unfair strategy.

AT Their Arguments

On the Violation

1. I meet – there is controversy about the true interpretation of international law or whether or not certain treaties are binding; the case isn’t descriptive
2. You violate; it’s a descriptive fact that (your contention level imapcts will happen/pain or pleasure is good or bad. Just insert their standard here and explain why its also descriptive)
3. I meet – you can use other principles in international law to turn case; you can say util impacts link in because I-law forces us to protect human rights.

Overview

* They don’t define descriptive, which is a reason to on face reject their interpretation because a) there is no brightline as to whether or not a standard is descriptive, which means the interp could never be a norm for debate b) The theory debate is zero sum because one side of the debate is always definitionally true- absent explicit definition we both violate and theory goes away.

AT Turn ground

1. Turn – lots of turn ground – there isn’t \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in all 185 ILO countries, empirically proves there is disagreement
2. Turn – Pic ground; ie focus on all of the aff except for one part that’s controversial under I law. Solves for the abuse – you can cherry pick your advocacy against a descriptive AC
3. Empirically denied! You made turns to case
4. You can still turn the aff you can read domestic contracts and weigh them
5. You can read other international contracts and treaties and weigh the legitimacy of the people behind the treaty
6. You can make arguments how Ilaw cares about poverty and the neg is best for that or how Ilaw cares about promoting the wellbeing of there citizens
7. Turn. You get way more K ground because I-law bites into literally every K and there are also specific K’s about how Ilaw is colonialist
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